

Pierre Geneviev
18 Rue des Canadiens, Apt. 227
86000 Poitiers, France
Phone : (33) (0)9 84 55 98 69, Fax: (0)9 89 55 98 69, Email: pierre.geneviev@laposte.net

H.E. Mr. John W. Ashe, President of the UN General Assembly
H.E Mrs./Mr. Permanent Representatives of UN Member States
Mr. Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations

Poitiers, December 20 2013

Copy : Mrs. and Mr. Heads of States and/or Governments, and Mrs. and Mr. Heads of International Organizations.

Object: Comments on the *report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on The Post-2015 Development Agenda* ([exh. 9](#)) and on our results on the MDGs presented in M. Ban Ki-moon report dated 7-26-13 ([exh. 11](#)) ; my UNSG applications dated 6-14-06 ([exh. 2](#)) and 1-12-11 ([exh. 1](#)) and the plate-form of proposals to support them ; my 2011 unfair and illegal deportation to France on February 3rd 2011 and my recent work. [A PDF version of this letter is at : <http://www.pierregeneviev.eu/npdf2/letunga-v2-20-12-13.pdf> .]

Dear Mr. Ashe,
Dear Mrs./Mr. Permanent Representatives of UN Member States,
Dear Mr. Ban Ki-moon,

(1) Referring to my letter dated 1-12-11 ([exh. 1](#)) concerning my application for the UN Secretary-General job and my previous letters, I take the liberty of writing you again **(1)** to make few comments on the *report on the Post-2015 Development Agenda* ([exh. 9](#)) and to point out the similarities between the priorities I had identified in 2006 and the ones put forward in this report, **(2)** to stress the importance of preparing the proposals I presented you in 2006 so that you can vote on their realization during the 2015 UN summit on the post 2015 development agenda, **(3)** to keep you informed on my situation and my recent work, and **(4)** to offer you my service to prepare and realize the proposals.

(2) But, first, I must apologize for staying silent these past **2 years and a half about** (since my letter dated 1-12-11, [exh. 1](#)), even though I was not really responsible for this silence since I was (unfairly and unjustly) deported to France few days after I sent you my 1-12-11 letter (on 2/3/2011 exactly). The deportation, especially in the way it was done, has caused me several serious problems on my return to France and it has slowed me down in my work (in particular it made it impossible for me to finish the book I presented you in my letter of 2011, [exh. 6](#) !), but I have not given up on denouncing the injustices I was victim of, and on explaining the well founded of my proposals that are still – today - extremely important for the international community (as the post 2015 development report confirms it). Recently, I wrote to Mr. Hollande ([exh. 18](#)), and to Mr. Obama ([exh. 19](#)) to underline the importance and urgency to undertake the global actions I presented you, and some of you may have received copies of my letters, but I had to write to you as well to present you few additional important arguments and **to encourage you personally to act urgently** to make sure that these proposals be ready for the two 2015 summits. I will reserve **part B** of this letter to explain you the problems of the legal aid system in France, and **part C** to give you practical examples of these problems, and to summarize you the efforts I made to address these problems (please see also the table of contents I put at the end of the letter for more details).

A The report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, and the preparation of 'global actions' for 2015.

1) The report's priorities compared to the priorities mentioned in my 2006 UNSG application.

(3) The report on the Post-2015 Development Agenda ([exh. 9](#)) proposes 5 priorities : '1) *Leave No One Behind. Eradicate extreme poverty while tackling the causes of poverty, exclusion and inequalities.* 2) *Put Sustainable Development at the Core. We must make a rapid shift to sustainable patterns of production and consumption, with developed countries in the lead. We must act now to slow the alarming pace of climate change and environmental degradation, which pose unprecedented threats to humanity.* 3) *Transform Economies for Jobs and Inclusive Growth. A profound economic transformation can end extreme poverty and promote sustainable development, improving livelihoods, by harnessing innovation, technology, and the potential of business.* 4) *Build Peace and Effective, Open and Accountable Institutions for All.* 5) *Forge a New Global Partnership. A new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability must underpin the post-2015 agenda.'* And of course **I can only agree with these 5 priorities** because, as some of you may remember, **I identified almost exactly the same priorities in my 2006 UNSG application** and my 11-29-05 letter ([exh. 2](#), [exh. 3](#)).

(4) **On the first priority** [1) *to eradicate extreme poverty...*], in my 2006 UNSG application ([exh. 2](#)) [and in my 29-11-05 letter ([exh. 3](#)) in which I presented the plate-form], I explained 'you' (or your predecessors) (1) that it was important to tackle the causes of poverty [the psychological, systemic, and religious causes of poverty] and (2) that we had to set up the eradication of extreme poverty as our goal for efficiency and humanitarian reasons [I wrote on page 8 of my 14-6-06 letter ([exh. 2](#)): '*MDG Goal 1 – to halve extreme poverty by 2015 (often called ambitious!), was to me a little 'harsh', not to say inhuman. ... As I mentioned in several of my letters, the 'time' is a critical factor in the fight against poverty because we absolutely must break the vicious cycle that lead to a number of poor that increases faster than the number of rich people. ... A higher objective and a greater effort over a shorter period of time might therefore be a better strategy to tackle the poverty problem ...* ...Because of the rapid evolution of the Internet these last few years, of the great possibilities it brings to resolve the problems of poverty (and other global problems) faster, and of the proposal to add poverty reduction related objectives to the Kyoto protocol, I would be grateful to you if you accepted to re-evaluate **this Goal 1** and asked me (if you selected me as SG) and the 3 other organizations concerned to study the possibility to reset this particular objective to: **eradicating completely extreme poverty by 2016** (not 600 millions people, but 0 person living under \$1 a day by 2016). ...']; and in the conclusion of my 29-11-05 letter ([exh. 6](#)) : '*To defeat poverty rapidly is good for everyone because it will lead to a steady growth in rich countries over a long period of time, and indirectly will bring more wealth and peace for everyone. But for that, we must focus more on the fundamental causes of poverty. We must address the 'psychological' or 'will' causes of poverty likeWe must tackle the systemic causes of poverty like (4) the unfair remuneration system that is a key issues to build an honest and fair society ...*'].

(5) **On the second priority** [2) *Put Sustainable Development at the Core ...*], here also in my 2006 UNSG application ([exh. 2](#)) and my 5-4-05 letter ([exh. 4](#)), I had already stressed the importance of addressing the two problems (development and environment) together '*to put sustainable development at the core*' [in my 5-4-05 letter ([exh. 4](#)) I wrote : '*... First, I believe that every one of you would agree that 'we' don't need poverty or that the US or France, for example, does not need the about 3 billions people living under \$2 / day to be rich. In fact, it is exactly the opposite, the US is very rich because Europe and Japan,, are rich, and can buy US products. ... We can also deduct further that solving the problem of poverty*

rapidly would probably create **a steady growth** (or diminish the risk of recession) in rich countries for quite a while (which is good for everyone). In this context, one can naturally wonder why our progresses on poverty are so slow, why our objective on poverty are so 'low' (outrageously so inhuman), and why so little effort is made to really tackle the problem of poverty. The response comes rapidly when one read about our environment problems like the global warming, important emission of greenhouse gas ... One of the intermediate reports of the Millennium project mentions this fear (2 lines in 50 or so pages report), ... **It would also be wise to link the discussion on the Kyoto protocol to the discussion on the fight against poverty, and to ask for common engagements on these two related subjects** [even though the negotiation are already complex], so that everyone **understands** that rich countries do not diminish their emission of greenhouse gas (or lower their consumption of energy) just to protect the planet, but also to solve the problem of poverty faster ... The commitments of the Kyoto protocol should be associated with poverty reduction engagements [including behavior or life style change] and should be taken by **every** country because it is critical that everybody understands that...].

(6) **On the third priority** [3) *Transform Economies for Jobs and Inclusive Growth. ...*], this priority was also clearly described in my 2 letters [the 2006 UNSG application ([exh. 2](#)), and the 29-11-05 letter ([exh. 3](#))], I explained the imperfection of our economic system [that I called 'remuneration system'; M. Lamy calls it 'market capitalism' and it is a better term] that creates obvious and unjustified - in our days - inequalities. The examples of unjust and disproportionate remunerations that I gave 'you' in my letters are so numerous that I cannot recall them all [like this US executive, Martha Stewart, who made 500 millions dollars during and **because of her 5 months stay in jail** or the 16 years old girl who made 10 millions in a year for playing golf...], but in this matter things have been worsening, so I can mention the last 'summit' achieved to summarize our problem [in 2012, Mr. Mark Zuckerberg, the founder of Facebook, arrives at the top of the list of the highest CEO remunerations with a total of **\$2,28 billions** (the second has made \$1,12 billions, [exh. 16.3](#))], **I will come back on this issue**, but you must understand that if we do not address the issue (of finding the alternative to market capitalism), we will fail at '**tackling the main causes of poverty, exclusion and inequalities**', and fail in all our objectives. [I will only quote my 5-4-05 letter, even though I addressed the subject in other letters as well : 'I would like to come back on the unfair remuneration system and the differences between 'power' and 'responsibility' because it is related to the problems described above. It is obvious that while the salaries of movies stars, sport stars, pop stars, and high level executives [**\$230 millions for this year 'champion' when the chief justice makes \$ 200 000, this gives an idea of how much the 'society' values justice!**] has increased in outrageous proportions, the salaries of civil servants and politicians staid limited in comparison. **In our information society, this increasing difference (that no one can ignore) necessarily creates a feeling of being 'lower than nothing'**. ... These outrageously high salaries - not at all in relation with their recipient's contribution in the progress of society - unfairly lower the contribution of civil servants and politicians (and others) in the progress of society and lead to grave problems. ...]. You can see that with \$2,28 billions in a year we are far from 2004's champion who made \$230 millions.

(7) **Finally, on the fourth priority** [4) *Build Peace and Effective, Open and Accountable Institutions for All ...*], here again I also stressed the importance (a) of making administrations and civil servants **more accountable**, including toward the poor (and proposed, among others, to withdraw the immunities given to civil servants and administrations, and to improve our legal aid system) and (b) of improving our justice system which **is key 'to make institutions more effective, accountable, and open'**; in fact it was the first point that I addressed in the 29-11-05 letter ([exh. 3](#)) [I wrote : 'In the US again, a lot, if not most, of social aids is given through 'non-profit organizations' that have no obligation toward the poor and are not liable for their act toward the poor, or are not accountable. The homeless shelters, mostly run by faith based or non-profit organizations, is an example of this, they can impose **outrageous** rules on the homeless without being responsible or liable for their acts or policies! The government uses these non-profit organizations to escape its responsibility toward the poor and to discriminate them more easily, ... At the same time, the US law is filed with immunities for administrations and civil servants (like 11

amendment, immunity for violation of civil right given to the US, and to many civil servants,) that render the government not liable for the wrongdoings of its employees and/or make it very difficult to sue administrations to be compensated [recently, Mr. Cheney even asked some Senators behind close door to give the immunity for torture to the CIA!]. Since the word 'Accountability' has been used **often** recently,..., everything is done (by law or systems of law, administrations' operations) to make sure that 'non-profit organizations', administrations or civil servants -who are dealing with (or helping) the poor- are **not 'accountable'** for their acts, and to make sure that the poor are denied justice in every possible way - **which is of course a important cause of poverty'**; and I summarized my point in the 6-14-06 UNSG application letter as well in the conclusion: '(2) bringing more justice in the world by improving our legal aid system and making civil servants more accountable, particularly toward the poor (including judges)'].

(8) I did not talk about the fifth priority [5] *Forge a New Global Partnership. A new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability must underpin the post-2015 agenda.*'], but the plate-form promotes '*a new spirit of solidarity, cooperation, and mutual accountability*', I believe. I am not a government agent or a civil servant, I am a member of the civil society, but I felt (accountable and that) I had a responsibility to explain you what I understood about our global problems and priorities, and to make proposals to help the world resolve its global problems, and this brief summary of my recommendations in 2006 and the report of eminent persons show you, at least, that I had understood the world's problems and priorities well. The panel also recommends to improve 'our information system' or '*to make a data revolution*' [they write on page 24: '*Better data and statistics will help governments track progress and make sure their decisions are evidence based; they can also strengthen accountability. This is not just about governments. International agencies, CSOs and the private sector should be involved. A true data revolution would draw on existing and new sources of data to fully integrate statistics into decision making, promote open access to, and use of, data and ensure increased support for statistical systems.*'], and of course I had not only stressed the importance of this work, but I also made specific proposals to achieve this goal with my proposal to improve the transfer and integration of statistical data at the world wide level presented in the Inco European program [see proposal at [exh. 12.1](#), [exh. 12.2](#), [exh. 12.3](#)] and with the proposal to create a new Internet International Organization to, among others, develop and maintain global computer applications that could be used by Ios and countries administrations.

(9) The report also sets more specific goals and targets **that are extremely important**, of course, and it mentions in page 16 :'*We believe that if these goals and their accompanying targets were pursued, they would drive the five key transformations – leave no one behind, transform economies, implement sustainable development, build effective institutions and forge a new global partnership.*'; but I don't think that pursuing the goals **alone** will be enough to achieve them and '*to drive the keys transformations we need*' - our results on the MDGs confirm this fact, I believe - ; we need more than the goals and than pursuing them, **we also need specific global actions** (projects) to help countries achieve their goals. I will give you here two examples that I will develop below: **(1)** we will not '*transform our economies and significantly decrease the inequalities*' if we do not find the '*alternative to market capitalism*', and **there is no way we will find this new economic system** (that takes into consideration the problems and limits of our modern, global, environmentally and socially responsible, and respectful of human rights society), **if we do not look for it and define/specify exactly what we want our economic system to do**. And **(2)** there is no way we will eradicate extreme poverty if we do not design a legal aid system that is respectful of the poor fundamental rights and that is budgetarily feasible, and this is also impossible to achieve without a global action like the one I propose [as a parenthesis, I want

to mention (1) that I did not have anybody to advise me when I defined the priorities, made the proposals and sent my UNSG application in 2005 and 2006, I was living in 12 M2 room costing me \$250, and my minimum revenue (the GR) was \$221, so I had to save \$29 from my \$150 food stamps (I saved 99c every time I went to the food store because the smallest food stamp was one dollar; and (2) that I did present you these priorities and proposals in the context of a UNSG application and after a rigorous intellectual work and process, so it was not a coincidence].

2) Our results on the MDG and the important work to be done before September 2015.

Even if 'we' achieved the first goal, the result shows that we planned badly and that the world, apart from China, failed.

(10) I must now come back on our results on the MDGs because it is very important to analyze what happened during the past 15 years if we want to achieve our goals in 2030, and of course everyone of the reports rightfully stress the importance of using the experience we have acquired trying to achieve the MDGs. But I do not make exactly the same analysis of our results on the MDGs as the panel of eminent persons or M. Ban Ki-moon or the sustainable development solution network, and I must also mention what is, I believe, a significant 'oublie' (oversight) in the eminent persons report. The panel's report talks about '*Remarkable Achievements Since 2000*', and it is obvious that some progress was made, but I believe we must look at the result **a little bit more closely**, particularly at our results on poverty (1) **because** even if the first MDG objective seems to be achieved, the detailed result shows (a) that **we had planned badly** our MDGs and (b) that **in fact** most of the world has failed on this first goal, and (2) **because** we cannot just rely on the global MDG result that hides the bad result of the world except China if we want to understand the causes of poverty [in particular our imperfect economic system, our weak justice systems, and terrible environment situation]. Mr. Ban Ki-Moon writes in his 26-7-13 report ([exh. 11](#), no 23) that we have already achieved our first MDG ***of halving in percentage the number of people living in extreme poverty***, and **he points out** also that most of the progress is due to the result of China and India which are of course very populated countries. According to the statistics I read, China has taken out of extreme poverty, between 1981 to 2010, about **680 millions persons**, out of a total of 730 millions persons who had the chance to exit extreme poverty, so we can **pretty much** say that China has achieved by itself the first MDG.

(11) It is important to point that out for several reasons : first, since there were about 1.2 billions people living in extreme poverty in 2000 and the UN plans that there will be about 1.3 billions people still living in extreme poverty in 2015 [Mr. Ban Ki-moon's report no 70, [exh. 11](#)], the fact that China took out 680 millions people out of extreme poverty, **means that**, instead of diminishing the number of extremely poor, **the rest of the world probably added around 350 millions persons in extreme poverty** between 2000 and 2015 and that at the same time it did not control so well the population growth, which are two **serious failures** for the (rest of the) world [in particular rich countries which have a great influence and are supposed to play a special role in development]. This failure of rich countries is confirmed in a way when **we look at the significant increase of inequalities everywhere around the world**, including in rich countries and too particularly in the US [in my recent letter to MM. Hollande and Obama ([exh. 19](#)), I cited Mr. Fitoussi's 2013 book '*le théorème du lampadaire*' stating that he thought the increase of inequalities was a **major cause, if not the main cause**, of the 2008 (subprime) financial crisis and **giving unequivocal recent statistics** on this subject; see Fitoussi, '*le théorème du lampadaire*', p. 97 : aux USA '*le top 1% a accaparé, sur la période 1976-2007, 58% de la croissance générale des revenus, et, sur la période 2002-2007, 65%. Ce pourcentage monte même à 93% pour les années immédiatement après crise (2009-2010)*' ! ; and p. 103 '*Je considère la croissance de inégalités comme l'une des causes réelles majeurs, si ce n'est la cause principale, de la crise financière*'.]. Second, China's

results (achievement in poverty reduction) should teach us at least two things: first that it is critical that we have a global coordinated strategy (set of actions) to achieve our global goals [if China did so well, it is certainly due in part to the fact that they had not only good objectives, but also a politic, a plan, a coordinated effort (including a strict control of the population growth), to achieve these objectives]; and second it is critical to control the population growth as China has done fairly well (through strict laws on the matter), the post 2015 development report does not plan any goal or target in this area (population growth control) and this is an important oversight for me.

(12) We set up the MDGs, but we did not plan any global actions or projects to help countries achieve their objectives, and **we did not set up good (MDG) objectives obviously**. If China that was not as advanced technologically and as rich as rich countries, was able to take so many people out of extreme poverty, **we** (the rest of the world, in particular MM. Annan, Johnston, Wolfenson, and Camdessus ,with the support of rich countries) **planned very badly for the rest of the world**; in fact it seems we had no intention and no will to take people out of poverty [probably because 'we' were afraid that taking too many people out of extreme poverty would endanger the world that was already very polluted, because 'we', rich countries, did not want to make any significant effort to decrease 'our' greenhouse gazes emissions, and because we wanted to give always more money to the rich as it happened...]. Unfortunately, this poor planing **(1) has caused us great troubles**, I believe [I know that the '*bad MDGs objectives and planning*' was/is **not** listed as one of the causes of the '*sub-prime economic crisis*' and the subsequent debt, banking, crisis that had very *grave* consequences for *many*, **but** if we had addressed the causes of poverty *and inequalities*, and transformed our economies between 2000 and 2015 as we plan to do now, we would *probably have* avoided the sub-prime crisis...with all the grave consequences it had around the world], and **(2) leaves us with an even greater work to do now** [there were **about 1,2 billion** persons living in extreme poverty in 2000, and the UN plans that there will be about **1,3 billion in 2015**, and our environment situation has worsened significantly as M. Ban underlines it (no 89, no 30, no 72, [exh.11](#))]. All this means that we cannot and must not limit ourselves to the objectives mentioned in the panel's report, **we must also absolutely have a coordinated strategy and a set of global actions (projects) to help countries achieve their goals**, and we must also control the population growth as China did (in an efficient way, if not necessarily the way China did it), and even more now than China is easing up its rules on the subject [I am not trying to minimize the importance of local programs (millennium villages, World Bank development projects, ...), it is important to continue working locally, I am just saying that it is **also** critical to have few global actions to address important **global intellectual issues and global causes of poverty**.].

M. Ban Ki-moon's intermediate report dated 7-26-13 and his planning until 2015.

(13) In his 7-26-13 intermediate report ([exh. 11](#)) on the MDGs M. Ban Ki-moon summarizes our results on the MDGs, gives a sort of planning until September 2015 to set up the post-2015 development program, and also reminds everyone of the importance of finding *a legally binding agreement on greenhouse gazes emissions* in the Paris summit in 2015 (no 88), and according to his planning you already started discussing the development program and goals during the last UN General Assembly on 9-25-13. But he does not propose the preparation of any set of global actions to help countries achieve their objectives although, as I have explained you before, it is critical to have a global strategy (not limited to the objectives) to succeed. And to be able to agree and vote on this set of proposals in mid 2015, **we need to prepare them ahead of time**, from now to mid 2015 [for each proposal (for example, the creation of a new Internet IO, the design and development of a alternative to market capitalism, the design of a new legal aid system,) **we must plan the realization of the project, study the cost, find the financing, study the impact on the development objectives, etc...**, so that you have in September 2015 precise information to

vote on the matter and this preparation work takes time]. If we do not prepare any proposals during 2014, it will be too late in 2015 to start any action, while preparing something in 2014 does not prevent us from giving up in 2015 a specific proposal if a **major** problem arises, **so we need to start urgently**. In my letter to Mr. Hollande on 8-28-13 ([exh. 18](#)), I explained him the importance of constituting a working group to prepare the proposals I presented you in my UNSG application and asked him to bring this subject to your attention at the last world summit in New York on 9-25-13, so you **may** have been informed and thought about it already.

(14) During the recent convention on climate change in Warsaw, countries were again divided and had difficulties to agree on the proper planning until 2015 (according to my readings). It seems that poor countries plus China denounced rich countries' failure to set up the special fund they had promised to set up in Copenhagen, and refused to prepare their engagements of greenhouse gazes emissions reduction by the end of 2014, and of course it was also pointed out that the effort of rich countries (to date) does not even reach 20% reduction of emissions by 2020 although **the UN required a 26% to 40% decrease**. And as you know, I am the first one to point out that rich countries must respect their engagements in term of ODA, but there are many ways rich countries can give money to poor countries [transferring technologies to poor countries is a way to give money to poor countries...], and again giving money will not mean as much **if we do not agree** at the same time on a strategy (a set of global actions) to achieve our goals and targets, so talking about money (to fight the consequences of global warming in poor countries) **without including** in our (climate change convention) discussion, our post 2015 development goals and targets and efforts, and the global proposals to help countries succeed, will most certainly fail (rich countries may take some engagements as they have engaged themselves to pay 0,7 of GDP in ODA, but they will probably not fulfill all their engagements as they did for the ODA, especially if they do not at the same time **plan** and **achieve** significant results in greenhouse gazes emissions reduction as it is now). You should see how in France no one talked about the report of eminent persons on the post 2015 development agenda ; the press and media **extensively** talked about the GIEC recent report on climate change, but they completely ignored the eminent persons report planning to eradicate extreme poverty although the two are linked and indissociable as you know, and **now rich countries are concerned by goal 1 also at least**.

(15) If we develop a new economic system that helps us speed up the convergence between rich and poor countries, decrease the inequalities, ... and remunerate everyone more in proportion with their relative contribution to society's progress, **it will be of considerable help for poor countries**. Similarly, if we create a new Internet IO to, among others, bridge the digital divide and facilitate technologies transfer, **it will also help poor countries tremendously**, so poor countries should fight on these issues and work with rich countries to have coherent objectives (goals and targets) **in the two areas** of poverty reduction (development) and greenhouse gazes reduction before (or at the same time) **they ask for any money** (money will come more easily if we agree on the objectives and the strategy to achieve them because there are many benefits associated with clean poverty reduction for rich countries). It is therefore critical to create in early 2014 a working group in charge of preparing the proposals I presented you and to add these topics (the discussion on the proposals and the vote for their realization) in the UN 2015 summit (below I will come back on the main proposals I presented you and go into more detail for one of them). Mr. Ban writes at no 113 : *'To that end, the Assembly could request*

its President to hold consultations on a procedural resolution for initiating preparations for the summit, **in which it could request the Secretary-General to prepare a report on modalities, format and organization for submission to the Assembly by March 2014.** That report could serve as the basis for the Assembly's consultations on a comprehensive resolution on the timing, scope, format, participation and expected outcome of a summit in 2015.' ; so 'you' (including M. Ban Ki-moon) still have time to include in the outcome of the 2015 summit, the discussion and vote on the proposals **which the working group will have prepared** (in cooperation and consultation with 'you', UN member states) and submitted to you in May 2015. This plate-form of proposals will be the link between the post 2015 development agenda and the greenhouse gases emissions reduction objectives; and it will also allow countries to evaluate more precisely the amount of money needed to collect the many benefits of our efforts [starting collecting money to fight the consequences of global warming **is also very negative** when we still can (and must urgently) act to prevent these consequences]. I will now briefly come back on the proposals.

3) The main proposals of the plate-form.

First, the search for the alternative to market capitalism.

(16) Since the 11-29-05 letter ([exh.3](#)) and the 6-14-06 letter ([exh.2](#)), I regularly wrote to 'you' about the proposals (to help the international communities resolve its global problems), **but 'you' now have come up with objectives that are very much in accordance with the vision of the problems I had given you in 2005-2006 as you could see above**, so it is now even easier for me to explain you (and for you to understand) why the specific few proposals I presented you **are so indispensable to help you succeed.** **First, the search for the alternative to market capitalism**, our old economical system which did not adapt so well to globalization, to our environmental constraints, to human rights conventions, ...; this proposal **is a key proposal** that addresses priorities 1 (eradication of extreme poverty, '*a new agenda that must tackle the causes of poverty, exclusion, and inequalities*'), 3 (transformation of economies...), 2 (put sustainable development at the core) and even 4 (build peace and **effective, open, and accountable public institutions**). **Our actual economic system is obviously one of the main causes of poverty, exclusion and inequalities**; it has **always** created automatically inequalities [even if this has become more and more obvious and publicized in our (new) information society, as the example I gave you above of Mr. Zuckerberg who arrives at the top of the list of the highest CEO remunerations in 2012 **with a total of 2,28 billions dollars**, shows], and it is now also obvious that **it facilitates the increase of inequalities in the context of globalization** [many economists have argued that globalization was an important cause of the augmentation of inequalities (see Mr. Bourguignon's book '*la mondialisation de l'inégalité*', 2012), **but for me, globalization is not the enemy** (Mr. Stiglitz also seems to agree in his recent book '*le prix de l'inégalité*' 2012, I believe), **our economic system, 'market capitalism' is the main culprit**]. Giving \$2,28 billions in a year to one person when the presidents of the US, France, ... make \$400 000 or less, **lowers the value and importance of civil servants' work** so much that it has become '*une atteinte à la dignité humaine*' (an offense to human dignity), and even a violation of human rights (more specifically the article 3 of the CEDH).

(17) 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 a 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 sens 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 billions in a year** while it pays the President of the US **\$400 000 a year** about **or 5 700 000 times less** than \$2,28 billions, and an individual receiving the (soon to be) minimum revenue (in Germany, 8,5 euros /hour) of about **16 320 euros** a year **or about 139 705 882 times less** than this rich person (Mr. Zuckerbeg) **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 simply lowers the President of the US and an ordinary person receiving the minimum revenue **(1) in their rank** (relative rank in term of viewed importance of their work by society) and **(2) their situation** (relative fortune in term of viewed importance of their relative contribution to society's progress) **at a degree so high** that we can say it has reached the sufficient level to be called a '*degrading treatment*' [I often talked to you **about the difference between power and responsibilities**, and here is a good example of what I explained, we have set up constraints (human rights,) so high, that the only power we have is to be stupid (like when we allow such a system to continue to be used); we only have the responsibility to change our systems to make sure they fit the high constraints we established].

(18) And I believe we can say also that there is no way that we will decrease (such inequalities and) the inequalities in general significantly enough to achieve our objectives in 2030 **if we do not change our economic system** (market capitalism that allows such disproportionate revenues) and do not find a new economic system that remunerates people more in proportion to their relative contribution to society's progress. Such an unfair, unjust and inefficient system is an evidence of many problems that I described you several times in my letters. It shows for example some lack of courage and of dignity from our politicians, and also a form of corruption. Not long ago (March or April 2013) in France the government asked the ministers in the French government to give a full description of their fortune (assets, liabilities...), and the richest minister by far, Mr. Fabius, the French Foreign Minister, came out with a fortune of 6 or 7 millions euros, mainly because of a significant inheritance (!). Mr. Fabius is 65 years old about and he has been what you would call a very successful (and supposedly useful for France) politician since he has been Prime Minister and several times Minister, and also a '*député*' (representative) and mayor of an important city for a very long time, but in France **you still have at least 5 soccer players who make more money in one year than he has accumulated in his successful politician life** (with a good inheritance at the beginning) ! And the worse is that no politician says anything about this problem, they should be saying to everyone : '*hey, a president, a minister, a député ... have a more important role in the progress of society (to improve the life of the French people) than the best soccer player in France (and a role at least comparable to the one of someone like Mr. Zuckerberg), so we should change our economic system and design a new one that pays the people more in proportion to their relative contribution to society's progress*'. But they say nothing.

(19) And the fact that they (and politicians in the US, England ...) say nothing, show **in some way some lack of courage and dignity, little self respect and little respect for their work** [although many of the politicians are well educated and bright in France, politicians like MM. Hollande and Fabius have received good educations and are (certainly) bright, they both have been to the well-known French School ENA ('*école nationale d'administration*') which is an equivalent to the Harvard School of Government and requires very high-level of education to get in; and in the US someone like Mr. Obama also has received a good education (since he went to Columbia and to Harvard Law and was professor of constitutional law), so they have nothing to envy to any soccer player or even to any CEO of fortune 500 companies on that

Page 9 of 38 12/28/2013 03:07:11 PM
File name: letunga-v2-20-12-13-3.doc

respect. And as you know, their responsibilities are important too, in comparison to large companies CEO (if we consider that improving the people's living condition and maintaining peace and security is important)]. Their silence on this economic subject also shows a form of corruption (**not the usual corruption** since they do not necessarily make more money for it, on the contrary perhaps) because they not only protect the status of the very rich and the sport, movie, ..., stars which make undeserved fortunes, but as we have seen it these past many years (and above), they contribute also to the increase of the rich revenues and of the inequalities. Finally, it seems that our politicians and civil servants tend to express their frustration for not resolving this economic problem and for letting themselves be humiliated by these undeserved disproportionate salaries, by making sure that always more and more people become poorer and poorer (perhaps because seeing so many people so poor and vulnerable makes them feel a little bit more important and feel that they are much better of that this great number of very poor, if not the equals of sport, movie...stars or CEO...). We are now making plans **for the next 15 years** and we have set up high objectives like the eradication of extreme poverty, so we need to make sure that we address this economic and intellectual issue of inequalities increase and that we change our old economic system. We have the tools (technologies, knowledge, and resources) **to design a better system, and we can specify exactly what we want the new system to do**, and finally no one, no country, can honestly refuse that we start searching for the alternative to market capitalism (refuse that we start specifying, designing, ...), even if I do not doubt that agreeing on a specification, and later adopting the design of the new system will be difficult.

Then the creation of a new Internet IO and the development of a new legal aid system.

(20) These remarks on this economic proposal, '*the search for an alternative to market capitalism*', lead me to the proposal to create a new '**Internet International Organization**' that was at the center of the plate-form since it plays an important role to realize the other proposals. As I have explained you in my letters, the improvement of our information systems was the key to many economic reforms in France (and in other countries), and **the improvement of our global information system is also the key to finding a more efficient economic system**, like it is the key to improve our justice systems around the world. And the improvement of our global information system as well as the resolution of the internet problems identified by the WGIG in 2005 (see the 11-29-05 letter, [exh.3](#)), and the eradication of extreme poverty, **require the creation of a new Internet IO** (so that, among others reasons, we can develop and maintain global computer applications that can be used by every country in the world). In the 11-29-05 letter I commented extensively the failure of the WGIG and countries to find an agreement on the governance of the Internet, so I will not come back on the subject, but I believe that **now is the time to find an agreement on this subject** to put all the chances we have to achieve our development and climate change objectives. The plate-form of proposals I presented you and the September 2015 UN General Assembly meeting **gives us a new opportunity to progress on this subject**. But here again we need to prepare this proposal, and to bring you precise figures on the cost of such a project, the responsibilities and organization of this new IO, etc., and for that you need to create the working group in early 2014.

(21) The possibility to develop new global computer applications and to improve our global information system **will address : priorities 1** (eradication of extreme poverty, '*a new agenda that must tackle the causes of*

poverty, exclusion, and inequalities', in developing computer applications that can be used by every country...), **3** (transformation of economies... since it allows us to develop of our new economic system...), **2** (put sustainable development at the core by allowing us to realize our poverty reduction and climate change objectives) **and even 4** [build peace and effective, open, and accountable public institutions, in allowing us to improve of our justice systems (including the improvement of our legal aid system)]. This is why the creation of this new Internet IO is so important and at the center of the platform; and why it makes the platform coherent and doable. I will not (and cannot) develop here all the actions I proposed to improve our justice system (like withdrawing the judicial immunities to make the judges and prosecutors more accountable, or the improvement of the quality of justice decisions), but I would like to go into more details with the reform of the legal aid system because, here again, **there is no way that we will achieve the objectives you set up**, in particular the eradication of extreme poverty and the making of institutions more accountable, **if we do not design and develop a legal aid system that respects the fundamental rights of the poor and that is budgetarily feasible** [justice is very expensive, and to design an efficient legal aid system is **not easy at all**, not even for countries like the US and France. It is technically difficult and it also requires to change the way lawyers and judges work, think and look at the poor, I believe]. In the 11-29-05 letter I had talked about the French legal aid system's problems and I had explained you why it was so difficult to denounce the unfairness of the system through a legal procedure at the ECHR for example; it is still difficult as I have learned recently after the ECHR rejected my complaint against France on the subject, but in 2007 a French Senator, Senator du Luart, wrote a report on the subject that gave me a lot of useful statistics and information on our legal aid system to establish its imperfections. So I will now look into this matter into more details in part B below.

B The reform of our legal aid systems, one of the keys to eradicate extreme poverty and to make our institutions more accountable toward the poor.

1) The legal aid systems in France and the obligation to be represented by a lawyer to present most of the complaint in courts.

The lawyers in France finance 'in theory' more than 60% of the legal aid missions !

(22) Before I went to Switzerland, Belgium and then the US to seek asylum, **I did file** (in 2001) a **complaint against France at the ECHR** to describe the human rights violations I felt I was victim of in France [violation of articles 6 (rights to a fair trial), 3 (interdiction of torture...), 13, 14, ...]; in an ideal world no one should go seek asylum abroad without at least trying to resolve his/her problems through the appropriate legal systems which include, the national justice system, and for European people, filing a complaint at the ECHR, but practically most asylum seekers are just trying to save their skin, so they leave their country before even having the time to complain formally about their own country and administrations at the national level. The 2001 complaint at the ECHR shows then that I did not leave France on an impulsive act, on the contrary, I had already identified my reproaches against France which included violations of fundamental rights justifying the grant of the refugee status, and I had also complained about the French legal aid system as I explained in my 11-29-05 letter ([exh.3](#)). Even though the 2001 ECHR complaint was not as documented as the more recent complaint (8-8-12, I have now more information and statistics...), the European Court (ECHR) could and **should have** easily understood (at the time) that the legal aid system violated the fundamental rights of the poor (in particular article 6, 13, 14 of the CEDH), but

they did not and of course they did not motivate their decision. So I will give you now written proofs (from personal experiences,) and a mathematical proof that the system violates the fundamental rights of the poor.

(23) The legal aid system works as follow. First you fill out an application form describing the legal problem you have to resolve and why your case is is meritorious, and then you drop it at the local legal aid office (if you ask for legal aid to file a petition or appeal in higher courts, you may have to file your application in those courts which have specific legal aid office). The legal aid office (composed of judges and clerks mostly) decides if your application is meritorious; and grants the legal aid **(1) if your income fits the maximum revenue limits** (in France you get the full aid if you live under the French poverty level about, meaning if your monthly revenue is less than 940 euros about), and **(2) if your application is not 'obviously' without merit**. If they deny you the aid, they are supposed to render a motivated decision, but the motivation is mainly '*your application is without merit*', without a real explanation of why they think it is without merit (which is a major problem even if you have a right to an appeal). If they grant you the aid and you did not already find a lawyer, they assigned you one. For each type of proceeding the legal aid law assigns a number of 'unit' or 'credit' which represents **30 minutes** of work, and each 'credit' is worth **25 euros about** (at this time; the value may change every year with the '*loi de finance*'), so the legal aid pays basically **50 euros per hour to the lawyer** (which is not bad, since it represents for 40 hours/week about 8000 euros a month before deducting your costs, social security, retirement... office...), but the number of 'unit' (hence number of hours) paid for each proceeding **is fairly low in comparison to the number of hours needed to do the work properly** [for example if you are victim of criminal offenses , and you want to file a complaint with civil part petition to obtain a financial compensation in addition to having the perpetrators punished, the legal aid system **does not pay** any aid to file the first complaint at the police or the district attorney..., and it pays the lawyer only 8 units (or 4 hours of work) to file a complaint with civil part petition ('*plainte avec constitution de partie civile*' in front of the '*judge d'instruction*' – an intermediate judge who prepares, instructs the complaint for the trial - , the system is different than in the US, I believe,) and 8 units (4 hours) for the trial (at the '*tribunal correctionnel*' or '*court d'assise*') if any, so all together 16 units or credits (or 8 hours of work of 400 euros about, I believe), which is very little, if the case is only a little complicated as we will see below].

(24) The system does **not** look so bad, at first sight or if you compare it with the US legal aid system which does not give any public legal aid for civil matter for example, and if you do not go into the details of the law and of the way it is implemented by the lawyers and the legal aid offices. **So why this legal aid system is bad for the poor or why does it violate the poor fundamental rights most of the time ?** It is really not so difficult to understand why, **but the government**, the lawyers, the intellectuals (professor of law) and the judges have been closing their eyes and hears (on the matter) **for more than 20 years now** (the actual system was voted into law by the French Assembly in 1991, I believe), and **pretend that the system does not violate the rights of the poor** [unlike in the US, the lawyers, judges, and clerks do go in the street from time to time to complain about the system, but mostly they complain about the fact that the 'unit' value (about 25 euros now) is too low, and that it should be increased; meaning they want the government to increase the hourly rate paid to the lawyer, but the hourly rate is not the only problem of the system, so the service given to the poor stays very bad while the number of poor and missions increases]. In 2007 Senator du Luart wrote in his report ([exh. 21](#)) that the cost and number of legal aid missions had increased significantly and that we absolutely had to reform the system urgently for budgetary reasons mostly (but nothing was done so far).

His report also describes the organization of the system and some of its problems, and proposes **18 directions** to resolve some of them, but it does not explain that the system violates the rights of the poor **which makes it flawed (I believe)**, even if very useful for the statistics and precisions it gives. Her are some of its conclusions: first he explains that **more than 50 % of lawyers** do not make any legal aid missions [in Paris there are about 17 000 lawyers and only the ones who **want do to some legal aid** are selected for the missions].

(25) Then he writes that **9,6% of the lawyers** make **64% of the legal aid missions** (there are about 54 000 lawyers in France), and he takes the example of an average lawyer's firm around Paris to give an idea of the cost of doing business for the lawyers : this average size (small) law firm of 2,5 lawyers and 1,5 secretaries has a hourly rate **of 150 euros** and charges 1300 hours a year, its fixed costs (apart from the lawyers' salaries, I suppose) amount to 60 % of its sales, and its '*dead hourly rate*' (or '*break even point*') is estimated **to be 100 euros**. This means that for every hour made in legal aid missions, the law firm loses **about 50 euros (on its fixed costs)**, and that it finances '*in theory*' overall more than 60% of the legal aid missions cost [if the case is lost; if the case is won, the lawyer usually gets back the normal hourly rate (because he can ask the judge for the legal cost, I write '**more than**' because as I explained it above, the number of hours paid for each proceeding is most of the time not sufficient to do the basic work necessary for the case]. **Please understand that everything that I explain here is even more important when you know that to start most of the proceedings in court in France, you must have a lawyer,** and when you don't have one although it is required, you automatically lose the case, with sometimes very grave consequences for you as it happened to me in 2000 in my case against the French administration for my illegal dismissal ! To these numbers given in the Senator 2007 report, I would like to add **a recent personal experience** of the legal aid I received from a lawyer designated by the legal aid office of the French Administrative Supreme Court, 'Conseil d'Etat', (it should help you understand the problem even better), and for this I must make a brief parenthesis in my argument to give you the context in which I requested the legal aid.

My administrative complaint against the unemployment agency and a practical example of legal aid mission.

(26) Immediately after my return to France on 2-4-11, I enlisted at the unemployment agency [Pôle Emploi (PE)] as required by law and applied for the minimum revenue (ASS) that this agency (PE) pays [there are, in France, basically two minimum revenues (ASS, RSA) which amount to **almost** the same amount of money; one (ASS) is paid by PE (the requirements are stricter, you must have worked at least 5 years during the past 10 years), it includes a small payment to a retirement fund, and it pays about 50 euros more than the other if you receive the housing assistance; the other (RSA) is paid by another agency, the CAF (no requirement, except for being very poor and having no revenues also), the agency that also pays the housing assistance, and when you get the housing assistance, the CAF decreases your minimum revenue by 50 euros about, this is mainly why I had to go to court (!)], and my (ASS) application was denied (I started receiving the other minimum revenue, the RSA from the CAF). The first 2 denial decisions (from PE) were not motivated, only the third one (from the regional director) was motivated (it argued that by law the 4 years limit to re-apply for this ASS ended for me in December 2001, and therefore that it was now too late), but his decision was still questionable because the reason why I could not reapply for this ASS in 2001, was the fact that I was forced to go seek asylum abroad to avoid persecutions in France as my refugee status granted in the US established, so I had to file a 'petition' at the administrative court. I asked for the legal aid to file this request, and a lawyer accepted to help me, but when the aid was granted, she did not respond to my emails and phone calls, so I had to ask her to quit and presented my request alone [the lawyer's

association refused to designate another lawyer, see Part C 3) below]. The PE did not respond during the 2 months limit to respond to my initial request, but the court told me that they still would not rule on my case **before 2 years** because a new law forcing the court to handle immigration matters delayed tremendously their calendar since they had to judge these immigration cases urgently!

(27) When the court informed me of this 2 years delay, I had already lost more than a year [at 50 euros lost each month, 800 euros about, which is a lot of money when you know that I arrived with nothing in France apart from a shirt on my back, and the perspective of finding a job was not good], so I made an emergency proceeding to ask the court to order the payment of these extra 50 euros/month at least until it rules on my case (about 1800 euros). The Court denied my application (référé, is the French name, it did not think that I had demonstrated the urgency; unless you have been poor, it is hard to imagine what a loss of 50 euros every month can do to you and your health, it seems), so I had to petition the Administrative Supreme Court (CE) where a **specialized lawyer** (not any lawyer) is required. The review by this court is very technical (like in the US, it is not an appeal court, it corrects only the error of law), so just to obtain the legal aid from this court is difficult (you must basically write the petition just to obtain the legal aid) ; I understood this and made very rapidly the research to write the petition and to explain why the denial decision violated the law ([exh. 23.1](#)), and the legal aid office of this Supreme Court granted me the legal aid of **380 euros** (representing about 8 hours of work) and assigned a **specialized lawyer** to help me ([exh. 23.2](#)). I immediately wrote to him to send him the documents, time is an issue, (including my legal aid application which explained why the denial decision was illegal) and asked him to give me a chance to read his brief before he sends it to the Supreme Court. He responded to say that he had 3 weeks to present his brief and that he would send it to me, but he filed it at the court before he did so, and did not respond to my phone calls before filing the brief in which he withdrew 3 of the 4 arguments I had given (he only kept one, and his brief added nothing new from my application), and he asked for **4500 euros** for his work [if the case was won, representing in theory 8 hours at almost \$ 600 per hour (for 30 hours of work a week, that is a salary of about \$864 000 a year, not bad, when you know that the US president make \$400 000 a year)], which increased the cost of the decision for the French administration from **1800 euros to 6300 euros**, and surely enough my petition was denied ([exh. 23.3](#)) [see also the letter written to the CE chamber president [exh. 22](#)]!

An extrapolation which leaves no doubt that the system violates the fundamental rights of the poor.

(28) This means that this lawyer pretends **first** that he made me (and/or the government) a gift of (the charity for) **4120 euros (4500 - 380)** on this legal aid mission and therefore that **he financed about 91% of the legal aid** for this particular mission, which is consistent with the number (more than 60%) that I gave you above (and the ones given in the senator's report); and **second** that he furnished the same service (and/or quality of work) that he furnishes to his regular clients, when **I (and you) know that this is not true** (and not practically possible) since for example he did not give me a chance to read his pleading before he filed it to the court and did not even return my phone calls until after he had already dropped his petition to the Supreme Court, and he also dropped 3 of the 4 arguments justifying the emergency of my request (a key element in this type of proceedings) that I had given (without my consent). **If we uses these numbers and the statistics** given in the Senator 2007 report (and the global legal aid cost for France in 2010 of **330 millions euros**) to make an extrapolation, we come up with the

following figures: the lawyers in France would finance '*in theory*' every year **3 630 millions** euros in legal aid (11x 330, 91% financed by lawyers), and if we imagine that the lawyers win the legal aid cases **50% of the time**, they would **really** finance **1 815 millions euros**; which would mean that the 10% about of lawyers, about **5400** lawyers (there are about 54000 lawyers in France), who make **64%** of the legal aid missions would finance **1 205 millions euros** (in addition to their income taxes), about **223 248 euros per lawyer**, which is not possible when you know that these lawyers are **among the poorest and the least experienced** !

(29) **Now, if we suppose** that the lawyers win **3 out of 4 cases** (instead of 1 out of 2 above) and that they finance only 45% of the legal aid costs (50% less than what the Supreme Court specialized lawyer financed), everyone of these 5400 lawyers would still finance about 55 811 euros every year (in addition to their income taxes) which is still impossible because it is probably more than the average salary of young lawyers with less than 5 years **experience**. In this context, the legal aid system in France is not just **a form of dumping**, it is also a swindle or an organized fraud which **benefits the lawyers** because they have **no legal obligation** to do their work properly (since the number of hour paid is very low), and **there is no way to control their work** or even to complain about their work and the system [as you can see by looking at my experience described in part C, I have complained twice at the European court, my last petition is dated 8-8-2012, and I have also written to politicians, to lawyers' representatives..., to the press and media ..., but they did not respond at least until now]. I argued in my ECHR complaint and pretend here that our legal aid system violates **article 6 of ECHR** (the right to a fair trial, **in particular the equality of weapons**), and you can understand why, if the government pays the lawyer 30% of its normal fee, he (the lawyer) cannot furnish the same level of work quality that he furnishes to his normal clients, and therefore the poor does not fight with the same weapon as his/her adversary who pays the normal fee (including the administrations at the administrative court). Refusing to admit that the legal aid system violates article 6, the equality of weapons, is the same thing as saying that the hourly rate and the number of hours paid to do a complex intellectual work does not affect the quality of the work done, which is impossible, as you understand.

(30) If the hourly rate and the number of hours paid to do a complex intellectual work did not affect the quality of the work done, we could pay the Ministers, CEOs, ... the minimum revenue, and they would still do the same job as they are doing now, but you know it would not work. There is therefore no doubt that the legal aid system violates article 6 ; and because of the obligation to be represented by a lawyer, the entire justice system also violates **article 13** (the right to access the court) and **14** (the freedom from discrimination) because it prevents the poor from filing certain complaints in courts and it discriminates them in the justice arena by not allowing them a fair trial most of the times. **Our entire french justice system is therefore a fraud**, and it hurts the poor and society. Everyone hides behind the lawyers' '*promise*' that they do the legal aid work '*consciously*', '*promise*' which cannot be questioned as we have seen, but the reality is that the lawyers cannot do (and do not do) the work properly, and that the system works only **(1)** if the cases that are chosen are almost sure to be won, or **(2)** if they do not require a lot of work for the lawyer, and **(3)** if the lawyers do as little work as possible and charge in the cases that are won more than they have actually work ! In exchange for their fraudulent legal aid

work and silence on the illegality (and unfairness of the poor) of the system, the lawyers obtain **the obligation to be represented by a lawyer in most proceedings** (and there is even the obligation to be represented by a **specialized** lawyer in front of the Supreme Court !) which gives them a strong control over the justice and allows them to ask for outrageous hourly rates often (as you could see above above, about \$600 an hour to defend a poor asking for \$1800 of social aid !). They also obtain the possibility to work and to train themselves when they want with no legal obligation to do the work properly. The poor are the ones who suffer from this situation, **not the lawyers**, and the society also suffers, of course, because, among other reasons, the system increases the inequalities which contributes to economic crisis as Mr. Stiglitz and others have underlined it recently.

2) The legal aid system in the US, the objectives of an efficient legal aid system and possible solution to the problem.

The systems in the US and in France are different, but the result is similar : the poor and society suffer.

(31) To be thorough and to give you a better idea of the challenge ahead, I must make a brief comparison between the French and the US legal aid systems (France and the US are among the most advanced countries in the world, so if they cannot be fair on this subject, **we are in trouble to eradicate extreme poverty**) before I present you a possible solution to this particular problem **in the context of the global objectives and targets** described in the eminent persons' report. In the US the poor who cannot afford a lawyer and are charged with criminal offenses are assigned a lawyer ('*public defender*'), who is paid by the government, I believe, but in civil matters or if you are poor and victim of criminal offenses, **it is much more difficult to be helped by a lawyer** because there is no public legal aid system in these areas of law like we have in France (when you file a complaint, you can ask the federal court to assign you a pro bono lawyer, **but the courts very (very) rarely grant your request**, and the lawyer works on a voluntary basis with all the problems associated with such a system, similar to the ones that I described above). The US lawyers can also take cases on contingency fee, which means that the lawyer finances all the cost of the proceeding, but in return he gets 30% (or more) of the damage won by the poor. This kind of deal is possible **(1) when the injustice is obvious and fairly easy to prove** for the lawyer (who is most of the time specialized in the type of cases he handles), and **(2) when the damage is significant** to make sure that the lawyer makes enough money to cover the risk he is taking (or the investment he makes). Although the system appears fundamentally different from the ones we have in France since in France the state finances the legal aid basic costs for all the types of proceedings, in the end the two systems are similar in many ways.

(32) In France we have seen that the system can only work as it is **(1)** if the lawyers and legal aid offices make sure that the selected cases are the ones **(a)** who requires very little work and **(b)** who are sure almost to be won from the beginning [my personal experience that is described in my ECHR complaint ([exh. 24.1](#)) and in part C below, and the number I gave you above confirm this fact with no doubt possible]; and **(2)** if the lawyers do the less work possible (less than what they do for normal clients) and charge (if the case is won) more than the work they have really done. And in the US very similar things happen, the lawyer accepts the contingency fee deal only if the case is sure (almost) to be won..., and for the other cases the poor receive no help..., except that the choice

is entirely given to the lawyers in the US, and they are allowed to make (even more) money out of the back of the poor if the case is won [in France the lawyer can charge a success fee, I believe, but they rarely ask for one when they are designated by the legal aid office; they never asked me for one, at least, although the damage I asked for was often very high]. And in the US although there is no legal obligation to be represented by a lawyer in court (even in front of the Supreme Courts), **it is known** to be virtually impossible for a person (even when not a poor) without lawyer to win a case in Federal Court, and very (very) difficult to win in state courts without a lawyer ! So the two systems lead basically to the same results, the poor are discriminated, they are deprived of their right to a fair trial (**most of the time**), and even often of their right to access the court, and the lawyers make money (sometimes a lot of money) on the back of the poor with obvious cases without caring if the system protects the poor (in general). And the chance that the situation changes anytime soon is very low for several reasons (including the fact that no one care if the poor rights are violated !), **unless you decide to act on it**. Before talking about a possible solution, lets look at what the Senator 2007 report recommends for France.

Senator du Luart's proposals, the objective of a good legal aid system, and another possible solution to the problem.

(33) The Senator's report ([exh. 21](#)) **(1) notes the difference** of contribution to the legal aid effort between lawyers (the fact that most of the legal aid missions, 64%, are done by a small number of lawyers, 10%) and the fact that the cost and the number of legal aid missions have increased significantly since 1991 - which created a budgetary problem for France -, and **(2) makes 18 proposals to improve the system**, including, **on the first position**, to increase the hourly rate paid to the lawyers so that '*the lawyer be remunerated more justly*', and, **in second position**, '*to cover some of the legal aid cost by asking for a financial contribution to the lawyers who never make any legal aid missions*', **but this is really absurd**, I believe. There is not one good and honest reason that can justify that we ask the lawyers to finance the legal aid missions ; why should they pay for the legal aid (?) ; do we ask the civil servants working for the unemployment agency to pay the unemployment benefits to the poor, no of course not ! The report mentions also that lawyers are mostly **not in favor of creating a group of specialized public lawyers** who would do only legal aid missions in all areas of law as it happens in the US for criminal defense cases, I believe. They are against this proposal because they do not want to loose the benefits they obtain with the actual legal aid system [they have work when they want some, they have no legal obligation to do the legal aid work properly, and there is no way to control their work (as I experienced it), and they still get paid the normal fee when they win the case...]; and they don't care (and don't have to care) about the poor. To defend well the poor in court is difficult **and it is expensive** ; and to find a legal aid system that defends well the poor is not easy either, but it is possible. **The objective of a good legal aid system should be twofold, I believe** : first we want to protect the poor, make sure their fundamental rights are respected all the time ; and **second we want to discourage other people from taking advantage of the poor** because they know they are poor and vulnerable and are not well protected by the justice system [in his recent book, '*le prix de l'inégalité*', 2012, Mr. Stiglitz who talks about the subprime crisis, explains that the big banks cheated by encouraging poor and/or uneducated people to contract risky loans because they knew they had no chance to complain in court if anything went wrong... my case of identity theft described below is a good practical example of what Mr. Stiglitz talks about.].

(34) And to succeed, I believe **there is no other way than creating a group of specialized (accountable) public lawyers** who makes only legal aid work **to lower the hourly lawyer cost** [use a better organization, appropriate computer programs, and the size of the group to lower the hourly cost...]; and at the same time we must charge those who loose cases against the poor the normal fee of private lawyers, and in the cases where there are an important damage involved, the state must take a percentage of the compensation obtained by the poor (10 or 15%), like they do in the US with the contingency fee, even if not as much as the 30 % (or more) of the damage obtained in the US which is exaggerated. Of course we also need to make sure that these public lawyers **are accountable** toward the poor, just like we need to make other civil servants (including judges, prosecutors,) more accountable. The money made while helping the poor **must be used to help other poor**, not to pay for the Ferrari or private jets of lawyers. As you know, the US lawyers can make quite a lot of money while helping the poor, in particular in '*class action*' lawsuits, so the income generated by certain cases could greatly diminish the overall cost of legal aid missions for the state. As an example, I am asking for a compensation **of more 6,5 millions euros (exh. 38.3)** in my criminal complaint, so if the government helped me and we won, it could make **650 000 euros** on this case alone, plus the normal lawyer fees, if it took only a **10 % bonus for the damage requested**; and when you know that in 2010 the overall cost of the legal aid for the government was **330 millions euros**, it is not insignificant. I have explained this to the Minister of justice, Mrs. Taubira (exh. 17), but she has not responded so far sadly. We all (every countries) have **the same constraints to respect** in this area ; each legal aid system must respect the fundamental rights of the poor and must be budgetarily feasible, which is not easy to do, so we can work together on the design of one system that can be used by every country in the world. On August 28 (exh. 18), I asked Mr. Hollande to offer the UN to conduct the reform of the French legal aid system **in front of the UN General Assembly** and to think about and develop a new system (with all the global computer applications necessary, if possible) that could be used by every country in the world. It will be more difficult than to do a reform without thinking about the other countries, but the benefits for the international community are huge, and here again we must prepare this proposal for the 2015 summit.

3) Some human problems and the consequences of the flawed legal aid system.

(35) The technical or systemic problems of the legal aid system I described above are not the only problems we have, there also some human problems that I would like to mention briefly, before I look at the grave consequences of our legal aid system's flaws for the French society. An article from March 27 2013 in l'Express (exh. 16.2) explains how Mrs. Taubira **(1) hired** as special adviser in her 15 members cabinet a lawyer friend who is a **specialized** lawyer in front of the supreme courts [he works for free for Mrs. Taubira while continuing to work part time as private lawyer also], and (according to this article) **(2) 'forced out'** her director of cabinet, an expert in ethic, because, among other things, he thought that the hiring of her lawyer friend as special adviser **created a serious conflict of interest**. To me also it does create an obvious conflict of interest; it is obvious that **(1)** lawyers are a professional group that is directly interested by several (if not most) important decisions the Minister of Justice has to take, and **(2)** such an unpaid job for this lawyer put him in a great position **(a)** to influence the Minister decisions regarding the lawyers as professional group, and of course also **(b)** to influence

the outcome of many individual cases that his usual, future, or former clients or the clients of his friends lawyers and associates may have pending in courts. The possibility or not to address the dishonesty of the legal aid system (at the expense of the poor and for the benefits of the lawyers) for the justice Minister is a good example of the type of decisions that impacts the work and revenues of lawyers and that the Minister of Justice has to take. The behavior of Mrs. Taubira who asks her friend lawyer to work for free for her (and who in return obtains a huge influence on many legal cases and on the justice organization) therefore facilitates the corruption of the justice, and it is not an unusual behavior among judges, prosecutors, ..., who are in frequent contacts with lawyers and who, often, have studied the same subject and in the same universities ; even if judges, prosecutors, ..., do not necessarily show their close relation with some lawyers and their dependency on their points of view to take their decisions, in such an open, obvious, and/or visible way as Mrs. Taubira. It seems also that the clerks, judges, and prosecutors, ... who are so accustomed and 'please' to work with lawyers who have a high level social status in our society, feel humiliated when they have to be in contact with someone other than a lawyer, in particular the poor, which affects greatly their work and efficiency and the poor chance to obtain justice.

(36) To conclude this **part B**, I would like to point out the grave consequences for society of the problems I just mentioned. There were in France **in 2001 about 7,3 millions people** living under the poverty level (European standard, the poverty level in 2010 is less than **940 euros per month about, it was lower in 2001, of course**), **and the number was in 2010 more than 8,7 millions people** (it is certainly more now) ; **so** the number of people living under the poverty level that was already already high, has **increased significantly** (+1,4 millions) during the past 13 years or so ; while at the same time, **(1)** the UN was trying to decrease the number of very poor around the world (and China has taken out of extreme poverty **around 680 millions persons**), **(2)** the fortune of Mme Bettencourt that was \$15,2 billions in 2000, raised to \$30 billions today, the one of M. Arnault that was \$12,6 billions raised to \$29 billions, the one from M. Pinault went from 7,8 to \$15 billions ... (similar increase can be seen for M. Buffet, Gates, and others billionaires in the US), and **(3)** France has not decreased its greenhouse gazes emissions in the proportion the UN required and has not fulfilled its engagements in term of ODA paid to poor countries (both of which affects direly the poor in poor countries). The economic '*crisis*' (subprime,), our old, unfair and inefficient (in our modern society) economic system, and globalization do **not** alone explain the high number of poor (in one of the richest countries) and the increase of this number (the crisis certainly did not prevent the richest french men and women **to see their huge fortune doubled**); **the unfairness of the legal aid system** and the corruption of the justice have therefore **without any doubt plaid a role in the creation of so many new very poor** (the rich are well protected by the system while the poor are deprived of their right to justice most of the time, my case is certainly a good example of this fact) with the **grave grave consequences for society that results** [for example, the increase of inequalities is seen to be an important cause of the subprime crisis... (if not the main one) by several well known economists, and a cause of unemployment also ...by Mr. Stiglitz, see his latest book, (*le prix de l'inégalité*)].

(37) In my 6-23-10 letter ([exh.8](#)), I had described you similar justice problems in the US when I mentioned '**the incoherence in the US Constitution**', so it is extremely important that '*we*' ('*you*') address these very technical, systemic and intellectual (justice) issues if you want to eradicate extreme poverty because

France and the US are among the most advanced countries in the world, so many other countries have probably similar or worse problems. Sadly the different problems I just mentioned [legal aid system problem, the lack of significant effort to address global warming, ODA...] evidences also a deliberate and coordinated effort to make the rich richer and the poor poorer [as M. Stiglitz notices it also in his recent book ('*le prix de l'inégalité*')] that we need to point out and denounce now if we want to eradicate extreme poverty by 2030. As I have mentioned several times in my letters, **we need to pay a more careful attention to what is going in rich countries** if we want to resolve our global problems. And poor countries must work with rich to improve their 'systems', and when possible develop global computer applications that can be used by every counties in the world (we have many problems in common and the same constraints, so '*there is no need to reinvent the wheel every time*' as Mr. Michelin would say surely). And more generally, every country must (when possible) think the resolution of its national problems in the context of our international objectives, and for France to develop a new legal aid system that is respectful of the poor fundamental rights and budgetarily feasible in front of the UN would be a way of doing that and a way of helping the international community achieve its objectives. I would like to give you now a brief summary of my recent work and my recent difficulties (including practical examples of the problems I just mentioned here).

C The deportation from the US on 2-3-11, the criminal complaint '*with civil part petition*', and the efforts to denounce the unfair legal aid system.

1) A very unfair and inhuman deportation from the US on February 3rd 2011.

A deportation order full-of-lies and a criminal behavior.

(38) As I already explained you in 2011, the deportation order used to deport me ([exh.28](#)) is **full of outrageous lies** since it states that **(1) I never** applied for asylum, and **(2) never** had any permission to remain in the US, and that **(3) I overstayed** my 3 months visa (!); when obviously, I **applied for asylum on 5-15-02** which entitled me to stay after the 3 months limit of the visa waiver [see the AR of my asylum application, [exh.29](#)], and I always had a permission to remain in the US – I was even granted the refugee status (asylum) by the INS in 2002 **according to the refugee documents the INS and later DHS (USCIS) gave me**, [see the verification of status listing me as a refugee issued **on 9-5-02** ([exh.30](#)), signed and stamped by the **INS** status verifier that allowed me to stay in the US '*for an indefinite period of time*'; and again my refugee status was **never** terminated by the INS (DHS) pursuant to 8 CFR 207.9 (the appropriate statute to terminate a refugee status granted in error); on the contrary, my refugee status was confirmed twice : **(1) first by an administrative law judge** who confirmed the validity of the verification of status as proof of grant of refugee status (asylum) by the INS (see his decision at [exh.31](#) granting me 8 additional months of RCA refugee benefits, that was never appealed by the county or the INS, and therefore became final for collateral estoppel's purpose on this issue of the confirmation of my refugee status on 2-5-04 and certified my refugee status); **and (2) second by the USCIS (INS) Refugee Center Director** when, **after a formal verification**, he issued me a **A3 refugee** employment authorization card on 12-10-04 ([exh.32.1](#)); this '*A3 EA card is also an evidence of refugee status*' as you can see in [exh.32.2](#), (A3 is the refugee alien category)], so there is no doubt that I did **not** overstay my ('3 months') visa as stated in the order [the recent decision from the French AL judge confirms the validity of my refugee documents also, [exh.20](#)].

(39) Please understand also that I did **not** violate any law while **entering** the US or simply **during my stay** in the US, and was never accused of any crime (!). On the contrary, it is the lies in the deportation order that are **criminal** and part of the dishonest legal strategy the US Attorney office used **(1)** to defend the civil lawsuits I filed in 2004 and later, **(2)** to cover up the INS employees criminal wrongdoings on my case, and **(3)** to rob me of my chance to obtain justice [if I never applied for asylum as they write, and I never had any permission to remain in the US, then the INS employees cannot have lied on my refugee status and on the situation of the record listing me as refugee (and cannot have altered the record) in 2002-2003... !]. When the LA ICE office Director issued the full-of-lies-deportation-order ([exh. 30](#)) in 2008, and later when he, the AUSA, the DHS Assistant Chief Counsel and the LA ICE Chief Counsel representing the US, and the ICE employees who deported me, refused to acknowledge the refugee documents I was given by the INS/DHS and refused to cancel the dishonest order, they forced me to file pleadings after pleadings, and by doing so they *conspired to falsely maintain a deportation proceeding* [violation of PC 182 (a) 3]. They also *'committed act injurious (lies,)...to pervert or obstruct justice , or the due administration of the laws'* [violation of PC 182 (a) 3], 18 USC 112 (c) (2)], **and they 'knowingly engaged 'in misleading conduct with intent to hinder, delay, or prevent the communication to a law enforcement officer or judge of the United States of information relating to the commission or possible commission of a Federal offense'** [violation of 18 USC 1512 (b) (3); the criminal wrongdoings that took place on my case in 2002, 2003 (fraudulent alteration of record, issuance and use of an altered immigration documents...), and later, and that I described in my complaints to the FBI, AUSA, and the courts], all of these acts are criminal offenses. And of course the prosecutors and judges who ruled on the case covered up these criminal offenses.

An inhuman deportation on dishonest and outrageous grounds.

(40) To worsen everything **they put me in jail 5 days** before deporting me, and then deported me (on 2-3-11) with just a shirt on my back and **without letting me go back to my apartment** to pick up my belongings and to obtain the deposit for the apartment from the landlord, and by doing so they stole the little belongings I had left [my portable computer, some clothes, ..., and of course all the legal documents of my different lawsuits or proceedings filed during my 9 years stay in the US, including my asylum application, and all my research to write my book, which could have helped me to establish their guilt...]. In February in France, it can be very cold, and it was very cold when I arrived there, so I could have easily died in the street, if I had not had the incredible luck of finding immediately a homeless shelter that had a place for me and that accepted to take me with no notice on a Friday night at about 7 PM [the train company let me travel from Paris to Poitiers without ticket against a signed promise that I would pay double the price of the ticket within two months! And it can be difficult to find a homeless shelter in France, even in Poitiers, a smaller town, a refugee I met in the shelter told me that he had to sleep several nights in the street before getting a place in the shelter]. There were no honest reason to deport me and certainly no reason to deport me like they did because I was very poor and on disability, and certainly **not** at risk to fly anywhere (I still had 3 lawsuits pending, so I had no interest in going anywhere...). There were only dishonest reasons, and I must now give you a description as brief as possible of their grounds and of the legal context in which they deported me because they leave no doubt **(a)** of the dishonesty of the US administration, **(b)** of my good faith, and **(c)** of my right to an important financial compensation from the US.

(41) In my 6-23-10 letter ([exh. 8](#)), I talked about the well founded of my refugee status, and it will come even clearer here that it was well deserved, so I will not come back on this issue ; instead I would like to focus on certain issues of my lawsuits against the various administrations because they evidence even more the injustice of the deportation and they explain why the immigration service issued the dishonest deportation order. The fact that the civil servants lied about my refugee status and were negligent (even acted criminally sometimes) were the main issues of my lawsuits against the LA County, the SSA, the State of California, and the INS (filed first in 2004 for most of them), so if the administrations, including the INS, had been honest and sure that my allegations concerning my immigration status and their violations of the different regulations and civil and criminal statutes, they could and **should have ended** all possible contesting in 2004 in arguing in front of the judge that I never applied for asylum and never had any permission to remain in the US as they wrote in the 2008 deportation order. And the judge would have ruled on these issues and end all possible disputes in 2004. If I had never applied for asylum and never had any permission to remain in the US as they wrote, then I had no case ; and they would have won the case. The fact that they did not do this, simply proves that I was right. **Why did they change their mind in 2008** and issue the dishonest deportation order ?

The \$10 millions lawsuit against the SSA.

(42) I believe that the first reason is the fact that **the damage** in my SSA lawsuit was increasing very rapidly (it was close to \$10 millions dollars already), put them at risk to loose a lot of money if I won ; and a way to diminish my chance of winning was to create an '*intend*' to deport me. The SSA never questioned the '*disability diagnostics*' made by the county doctors or the health diagnostic made by the county cardiologist, they simply refused to pay me the SSI disability benefits on the ground that I did not have the immigration documents (hence or/) and status that made me eligible for SSI ; but it was a lie of course because my three different refugee documents (employment authorization card, verification of refugee status, and even the administrative law judge decision) **were all accepted proofs of refugee status and of eligibility for SSI by the SSA regulation** [the SSI was about \$140 more than what I was getting, the minimum revenue GR, but this is a huge amount of money in the condition I was living see above page 5 no 9]. After the SSA employees and the SSA AL judges lied about my refugee documents to refuse to admit that, I filed a lawsuit asking for a \$500 000 **monthly** penalty until the SSI is paid. In my condition the SSI (and its \$140 more every month) was **a life and death matter** because I could easily have had a heart attack any day with the health problems I had, the bad diet I had, the difficult living condition I was living in and the stress of the trials, and I believe that they finally understood it and realized that I could win my lawsuit with a damage close to \$10 millions, and decided to act to cover up their faults and frauds. The SSA regulation states that **(1) if you have** the refugee documents I had and **(2) 'if the immigration (INS, DHS) does not intend to deport you'** (and of course you fit the health requirement as well), then you are eligible for SSI disability benefits [sometimes aliens have valid documents, green cards, refugee cards, but they commit felonies (drugs or other charges), so the immigration wants to deport them, and to withdraw their immigration status (so the SSA regulation plans for these cases), but I did not violate any law and was never convicted or even accused of any crimes, on the contrary I sued the administration and civil servants the whole time I was there].

(43) And in 2005 when I applied for SSI, it was obvious that **the immigration ('INS') did not 'intend' to deport me** ; they had granted me an employment card every year since 2002, and **in 2004**, the director of the national refugee center had, after verification of my refugee documents, **granted me the 'refugee employment authorization card' (A03)** ; **in 2003** an AL judge had confirmed my refugee status and his decision was final because no appeal had been filed ; and, of course, before that the INS had **never** terminated my refugee status as it easily could have done if it had wanted to, so on the contrary my refugee status was certified by law (the collateral estoppel doctrine). This is why at the beginning of 2008, they issued their deportation order **to create 'an intend to deport me'** and indirectly (try to) make me ineligible for SSI. Moreover, even if the deportation order were full of lies, it made it very difficult for me to defend all my appeals or cases (not just the one against the SSA), I was forced to file urgent pleadings to try to avoid deportation and forced to ask for several months of delay to file my various pleadings in my remaining lawsuits (I needed to file urgent pleadings to try to avoid deportation); and it made it easier for the judges to dismiss my SSA lawsuit and the other ones too [the SSA proceeding was eventually unfairly dismissed in 2011 (I was already in France) because the court refused to acknowledge the validity of my refugee documents although the French court has now confirmed my refugee status and that my refugee documents were valid documents (as I explained you above)].

The third lawsuit against the LA County in which it defaulted twice.

(44) **The second reason** why they issued the deportation order was, I believe, **the fact that the LA County defaulted** on my third complaint (in early 2007) **had increased** my chance of winning the case, and it also showed that the County Counsel knew I was victim of grave frauds and that he wanted these frauds to end ... There is no other valid explanation to the fact that they did not respond on time to my more than \$2,7 millions lawsuit, I dropped myself a copy of the complaint at the LA County and 2 weeks later the police formally served it also, and they were waiting for it since the federal court had dismissed the previous complaint without prejudice to let me file it in state court, so the delay in responding could not be an oversight. If I won only one of my lawsuits, then the other ones were won as well because they were all related and addressed the same type of treacheries on my refugee to hurt me and to rob me. **The third reason** to issue the deportation order was also **to retaliate against my complaints** (civil and criminal, particularly the last criminal one of **December 2007** I sent to Washington as well as LA since they came to arrest me in early January 2008); **and to cover up the wrongdoings of the civil servants** who even committed crimes. All these reasons and the context of the deportation show you that **I still have many reasons to sue the US** (in France) **and to ask them to compensate me for the grave prejudice they caused me** (even if of course I would rather find a friendly settlement), but it is not easy to file a legal complaint against the US in France or in an international court, even after I obtained a decision from a French judge confirming the validity of my refugee documents. I will come back on my legal aid application for this case against the US ; since many of you are experts in international public law, you will easily understand **(a)** why the legal aid office was wrong when it denied my legal aid application, and **(b)** why it is difficult to obtain justice in such a case; but before I would like to describe you an other grave legal problem I had on my return to France and the efforts I made to try to resolve it.

2) My criminal complaint for forgery, obstruction of justice, breach of banking secrecy, concealment, ...against several parties including a big French bank and its CEO.

An unusual story which confirms the well-founded of my refugee status.

(45) As you know, a trouble rarely comes alone, and my deportation to France (with just a shirt on my back in the cold winter) on 2-3-11 was not an exception to this rule. About a month after my return, I received, at the homeless shelter, a letter (an order to pay a debt under the threat of lawsuit) from a company specialized in recovering unpaid debt [the debt had been contracted with a company **I had never heard of**, a subsidiary of one of the biggest banks in France and in the world]. It was a short letter ([exh.40](#)) saying that **despite 'their many interventions'**, I had always refused to pay 'my' debt, and that I had now to pay **within 8 days about \$1000** (or euros) if I did not want my belongings to be seized and sold [of course, I had absolutely nothing, no belonging and no money, so you can argue that the threat was not much of a threat !]. I immediately responded to say that I had never made this debt and never received any service or money from this company, and never received any demand to pay the debt before their recent letter, and I asked them to give me immediately all the details about this debt and also to admit that they had done an obvious mistake. They did not respond, so I called and they told me over the phone that it was a (revolving) loan contracted **in 1987** by 'a certain Pierre Geneviev' who was born in Poitiers on the same day as me (!), the loan was made to buy some goods, but they also said that they could not give me anymore information on this debt or for what it was used for (for privacy reasons !), and that I could contact the bank directly without giving me any name or place to contact. **On 7-2-11 I wrote to the bank's general manager** and also the manager of the subsidiary concerned **(1)** to summarize the problems linked with this unpaid debt, **(2)** to tell them that I was not in France at the time the debt was contracted because I was still finishing my master degree in the US, **(3)** to ask them to immediately give me more details about the debt, and **(4)** to tell me **how they had found me so fast on my return to France after 10 years of absence.**

(46) I also explained that this unpaid debt had created me grave difficulties **since it appeared that it had been used by the administration** (the Department of Essonne where I worked from 1991 to 1993) **to fire me in 1993**, and to keep me out work a long time [I explained that I had stayed more than 20 years unemployed, and that I had even been forced to go abroad to seek asylum, etc...]. **On 9-5-11 they responded to give me few details about the debt** (of about \$6000) : it was contracted exactly on 5-11-87 ; 'I, supposedly, paid it back from 1987 to 1990 ; then I stopped paying it back in august 1990 ; and they asked the 'caution' (guarantor of a loan) who had paid a little also ; and now **it still remained about \$1000 to pay** [they wrote also that they attached to their letter the contract, **but they (lied and) did not send me the contract!**]. They also wrote that this unpaid debt could **not** have caused me any prejudice because they are bound to the **banking secrecy** on this subject, so no one knew about the debt [in a subsequent phone call to a clerk, they also told me that the credit was used to buy furniture, but they refused to give me any details, who sold the furniture and to whom, why they did not sue me in 1990 or after 1992 or 1993 when the debt stayed unpaid, or even where and when they contacted me to obtain the payment of the debt, I had never received any demand to pay until 2011, and they refused to send me the contract they pretended that they had sent me in their letter of 9-5-11 !]. I responded to the general manager on 9-21-11 to explain **(1)** that the employees of the bank had necessarily committed **several criminal offenses**, **(2)** that he **had to send me more details about the debt** [including all the (usually related to the making of a loan) documents, ID, evidence of my employment,] and

(3) that he **had to admit that the contract was a 'forgery'** (a false document), because I had never signed it or authorized it, or even reimbursed it... **but he (they) did not respond at first.**

The criminal complaint with 'civil part petition'.

(47) It is only after I filed a formal criminal complaint at the DA office (*procureur de la république* in France) **on 1-13-12** that they wrote to me on 1-17-12 ([exh. 41](#)) and then 6-13-12 ([exh. 42](#)) to say '*that they were sorry, that they had done a 'mistake' and that I did not owe them anything anymore, they also said that they could not send me the contract because **all the documents had been destroyed** according to the law 10 years after the closing of the account', **but they refused (1) to admit that the loan contract was a 'forgery'**, and (2) to tell me (a) at which dates exactly the loan was reimbursed; (b) by whom (from which account or how); (c) when did they contact 'me' (when the loan stayed unpaid) to get reimbursed, how, where; (d) what was 'my' response; (e) why they did not file a lawsuit in 90-92 (to obtain their money back when the loan stayed unpaid...); (f) how they had found me so soon after my return from the US in 2-11 [because they necessarily violated the banking secrecy]; (g) **when the documents were destroyed and by whom** [it seems that they were destroyed after I told them that they had committed criminal offenses and even after I complained to the police; but whatever the time it was, it was **necessarily done to destroy the proofs** of their criminal offenses **which is an obstruction of justice and another criminal offense**]; (h) **the name of the business** who wrote the contract and sold the furniture. **In short they told me nothing to cover up their criminal offenses**, and they were just saying '*you are a thief who has not paid his debt in 25 years, and sorry we destroyed the documents that could allow you to prove that you did not do the debt !*'. I could not let that pass, this is also a criminal behavior. During 2012, I wrote and filed at the DA office **2 supplements** to my initial criminal complaint **to have the general manager** and some employees of the bank who refused to respond to my demands of information investigated and **charged by the DA for obstruction of justice...** , but the DA did not respond to my letters and phone calls ! **So** I wrote and filed (after a year, end 2012 about) a more detailed new criminal complaint with '*civil part petition*' (*plainte avec constitution de partie civile*) in front of the *investigating judge* ('*jugé d'instruction*') ([exh. 33.1](#), [exh. 33.2](#), [exh. 33.3](#)).*

(48) In criminal law in France, if the district attorney (*procureur de la république*) does not respond to your criminal complaint within 3 months, you can file a new criminal complaint '*with civil part petition*' in front of the investigating judge (*jugé d'instruction*) who forces the district attorney to give its point of view on the complaint (whether it is reasonable or without ground and should be dismissed...). This investigating judge is supposed to prepare the case for trial, in this case a 'she' sent my new complaint to the DA who responded with an order on 2-11-13 about ([exh. 34](#)) saying that, at first sight, my complaint did not describe any criminal offenses, nor the damage or the link between the damage and the criminal offenses [**which was not true at all**, my complaint was very precise and described all that, see a summary [exh. 33.1](#), and the [exh. 33.2](#) table of contents, 5 pages to describe the damages and link of causality, see also the detailed damage estimation ([exh. 33.3](#)), I am asking **for more than \$6,5 millions**, how can he ignore the damage or pretend that I do not describe the damage !], and therefore that he wanted me to be auditioned by the judge so that she obtains these information (verbally) from me (!?). It was a way saying : '*you have grave mental health problems and cannot even write 3 sentences in a row having any meaning (!)*'. The clerk of the judge called me (in April 2013 only), and told me (a) how I had to reorganize my complaint to respond to the DA's order and to prepare for the

meeting with the judge on 10-7-13 (but she refused to send me the DA's order, I did not get the DA's order until June 18, 2013 (4 months after it was issued), **although he is supposed to send me a copy by law**; the judge had also forgotten to send me a written confirmation for my complaint **as required by law**, and she waited 7 months to see me !); and the clerk also said **(b) that the police did not do any investigation on my complaint** because I had the possibility to file a complaint with civil part petition in front of the *investigating the judge* **which was very dishonest**, of course, because there were emergency auditions to be made to avoid that some proofs disappear, and it also made me loose one level of jurisdiction, and increased the prejudice for me and the suffering (I have been poor a longtime because of this fraud and others).

(49) The DA and the police were supposed **(1)** to do the basic investigations [to obtain the **basic information** and documents the bank refused to give me], **(2)** to identify the suspects (a requirement by law), **(3)** to analyze (briefly at least) the legal authorities and proofs I furnished to establish the violations of criminal statutes (proofs of the material and **moral elements** of the criminal offenses), and **(4)** to defend the interest of the victim (me) and **society** [in this case, the bank **admitted that they had done an error**, so at least they should have asked them (the lawyer who represents them) which error they thought they had done and also asked them (their lawyer) to give the basic information and documents (and it was very easy to do for the police, just a 1 or 2 hours auditions with the bank's lawyer to clarify the situation and to obtain the main documents, the basic information and the positions of the main suspects) ; and a mediation was possible also and they deprived me of this chance (the DA can help resolve the case without having to go in front of the investigating judge and to trial)]. The police and DA's behavior **was therefore very dishonest** [they refused to do their work because they knew they would necessarily collect the proofs of several criminal offenses by the bank]. So after the call from the investigating judge's clerk (in April 2013), I wrote on 6-5-13 to the DA supervisor (le '*procurer general*', a she in this case, see a part of the letter and the table of contents in [exh. 35](#)) **(1)** to explain that my criminal complaint contained all the necessary information the DA ordered me to give, **(2)** to reorganize the complaint to meet the DA's order request and to make precise reference to my initial complain to prove that all the information were already there, **(3)** to describe the violations of the criminal procedure statutes that the police and the DA had committed, **(5)** to underline the reasons why the complaint was well founded, why the bank and its employees **were necessarily 'suspects' in this case, and why they should be heard urgently**, and **(6)** to explain her **(a)** the problems I had had with the legal aid office, the lawyers that were designated to help me, and with the lawyer association that refused to designate another lawyer, and **(b)** why the legal aid system was not fair in this kind of case, and **(7)** to present her a formal **criminal complaint for harassment against X** in the context of my legal aid demands (harassment is a criminal offense, and the legal aid office employee ... **deliberately harassed me** to make me loose the legal aid ...) [I copied the letter to the judge and asked her if she could delay the hearing, so that the urgent auditions of the suspects can be made before my hearing and so that I can have time to resolve the legal aid problem and find a lawyer to help me; again I am entitled to a lawyer by law ([exh. 36](#))].

The hostile behavior of the investigating judge during the audition and my application for invalidity of the audition, the DA's order, and the missing investigation.

(50) The General Attorney did not respond to my 6-5-13 letter (at this day) and I saw the investigating judge on 7-10-13 as planned, but she was **very hostile** and refused to talk about the faults from the police and the DA, and about the fact that I did not have a lawyer to assist me during the audition although I was (am) entitled to one on my first audition with the investigating judge [and as explained above I had informed the judge of the problems with my legal aid applications...]. During the audition, the judge of instruction asked me absurd questions (whose responses

were on the first page of my complaint !), and when I asked her why she had not informed me of my rights, she just said that if I thought she was not doing her job correctly, then she stopped the audition, and simply stopped it ! I had taken **five weeks** to reorganize my complaint exactly as she (and the DA) wanted it, with all the information precisely referenced, but she just ignored everything like the DA to cover up the criminals and to rob me of my right to justice ! She was supposed to inform me of certain rights and I was entitled to be helped by a lawyer, but instead she simply **harassed me** with very obvious questions for which she already knew the answers and refused to address the important issues of the case and the legal authorities I had presented to establish the criminal statutes violations although again the bank admitted they had done an '*error*'. Her objective [as the objective of the '*procureur*', the DA] was to avoid reading the complaint that was very precise and to ignore the legal authorities and proofs I brought to establish the culpability of the defendants and culprits, and to cover up the whole thing (all the suspects) **to steal me several millions in damage!** And so far it is working fine, none of the culprits have been auditioned in 2 years, some proofs will be lost for ever, and I have lost already 2 levels of jurisdiction (the DA and the judge of instruction). I had no choice other than to complain on filing a special '*appel*' (request for nullity) at the Chamber of Instruction (the appeal court for investigating judge) **to try to have (a) the 7-10-13 audition, (b) the DA's order, and even (c) the missing investigation canceled (so that it can be redone).**

(51) I also had to ask for a change of court (of venue) because it was obvious that the judge had shown her partiality and that I could not have a fair trial anymore. If I had done nothing, they would have continued to cheat, but at the same time I knew that complaining was worsening my situation because I was not only complaining against several private defendants (suspects) anymore, I was also denouncing **the dishonest behavior** (even criminal behavior) **of several justice officials (!) which diminished seriously my chance of winning the case** (the judges and prosecutors tend to protect each others). On 7-19-13 I filed this '*request for nullity*' as it is called here ([exh. 37.1](#), *application for invalidity*) and on 8-20-13 I also asked the Supreme Court ('*cour de cassation*') for a change of venue ([exh. 38.1](#)), but these proceedings - that are usually very fast - have been slowed down deliberately again by the judge of instruction who took 2 months to transfer the file to the '*appeal court*' [the *Chambre de l'Instruction* sent its admissibility decision on October 9th, 13 ([exh. 37.2](#)), two and half months after, although it is supposed to render this first decision (on the admissibility) **within 8 days**, and the Supreme Court also usually rules rapidly on the change of venue request, but all the proceeding are unfairly delayed (see my recent letters to complain about the various delays in [exh. 37.3](#) and [exh. 38.2](#))]. As you see, the justice department employees cheat and lie on everything, and at every level of the proceeding : at the legal aid office first where everything was done to prevent me from obtaining the legal aid ; then the police and the DA that do not investigate without any honest and just reason, to cover up the suspects...; then the DA lies in its order, and does no work at all also ; then judge of instruction covers up all their dishonest behavior. And of course they use the time to cover up wrongdoings, to rob me, and to hurt me (they know I am very poor) **as well** [since I filed my first complaint on 1-13-12, **almost 2 years** and absolutely nothing was done to obtain the most basic information ... !]. The same things happen in France and the US, the judges, prosecutors... cheat, lie and even commit criminal offenses **in complete impunity** (the immunity makes many become thieves and criminals, and the entire justice system is designed to help them rob the poor). I will now try to describe you briefly the problems I had during my legal aid applications and the efforts I made to resolve them and to denounce the unfairness of the legal aid system.

3) The various problems I had with the legal aid office, the lawyers' association and the designated lawyers, and the efforts I made to denounce the dishonesty of the legal aid system.

First, the legal aid application to file a complaint against the US.

(52) As soon as I returned to France, I immediately tried to obtain the help of a lawyer **(1)** to denounce the injustices I was victim of in the US, including the dishonest deportation during which all my belongings were lost for me, **(2)** to contest the non motivated unemployment agency decisions refusing to pay me the minimum revenue (ASS) as I explained you above, and later **(3)** to prepare my criminal complaint, but the lawyers I first met during free 15 minutes meetings organized by the lawyers' association ('*ordre des avocats*'), and then the ones I contacted directly to ask for their help in the context of the legal aid system **refused to help me** [among the reasons they gave me was that it was not possible to sue the US or its employees in French courts or in France, but you know this is not at all as obvious as it may seem... **two lawyers accepted to help me for the complaint against PE**, but later they did not respond to my phones call and withdrew; and for the criminal complaint, they said banks don't commit criminal offenses , or if you were not informed that you were victim of an identity theft, you did not suffer any prejudice, etc., !!!!]. As to the legal aid office, at first it cheated to deny me the aid, for example it asked me to file some documents I had already given in my application, and asked me to give the '*jurisdiction*' I wanted to seize (in which court I wanted to file my complaint), and it wrote that if I did not give this information, my application would be rejected. This information (the jurisdiction) is not always easy to identify at first [especially for the poor who is not lawyer, and it also depends on the strategy you choose to present the case (there can be different type of proceedings to resolve one case), so the lawyer must be involved in this choice], and **the law says** that if the legal aid application does not contain this information or the '*legal qualification of the facts*', the legal aid office cannot reject the application on this basis (which makes sense and is and should be understandable), the only criteria should be whether the case is not obviously without merit. When the legal aid office asked me these unnecessary information I complained to the judge president of the court, but she did not respond and the legal aid office continued to ask me for the jurisdiction every time, even after I complained again to the president of the appeal COURT [see my letter, [exh. 26.1](#), his response and the legal aid office response and decision, ([exh. 26.2](#)), the legal aid office wrongfully rejected this first demand for my criminal complaint after I gave the information (the jurisdiction) a lawyer had told me to give !].

(53) The legal aid application for the case against the US was finally rejected with no honest motivation (just '*the application is without merit*'), as well as my appeal (by the appeal court). As you know states have certain immunities in foreign courts; in France to sue a country or its civil servants in front of a national court, you must complain about '*illegal acts*' that cannot be considered to be acts of '*puissance publique*' ('*acts of public authority*') or acts that have not been accomplished in the interest of public services, which is not always so easy to determine, in fact the legal authorities say that these cases of country immunity must be studied on a case by case basis [some writes that '*Le but principal de la puissance publique reste la satisfaction de l'intérêt général, devant lequel l'intérêt privé cède toujours*', and I don't think that deliberately lying in an administrative decision or in a deportation order **to hurt an individual and cover up criminal offenses of civil servants** or to commit a criminal offense can be considered to be '*in the general interest of society*' or an act which participate in the exercise of the state sovereignty..., so I had a case which was **not obviously** without merit]. And the LA County and its employees could not enjoy the immunity given to state in French courts because local administration (like town...) are not entitled to the state's immunity, and here they too had committed (criminal and civil offenses) acts that created me a

grave prejudice and entitled me to a reparation. So my case was definitively **not** '*obviously without merit*', I had many proofs of illegal acts that could **not** really be considered to be acts of public authority ('*acte jure imperii*', and were more '*acte jure gestionis*' as the experts write). Finally, the legal aid office **could not** make the determination of whether the US and its civil servants or the LA County and its employees were entitled to the immunity based on my legal aid demand (**which** is a simple form not bigger than one page) as it did (to deny my request for aid) **because** this is obviously a complex issue of law, and I should **be helped** by a lawyer to explain in details the **nature** and the **finality** of the acts which are the key element **to establish** if the immunity applies [and the supreme court is the one that should make the final decision on this subject, not the clerk of the legal aid office].

(54) And as you know also, a country can file a complaint against another country at the ICJ to obtain a compensation for internationally illegal acts against one of its citizen [I refer for example to the ICJ decision dated 19-6-2012 in the case '*Ahamadou Sadio Diallo (Republic of Guinea v. Democratic Republic of Congo)*' in which the ICJ granted a compensation for the arrest, confinement ... and deportation of M. Diallo by the Democratic Republic of Congo (\$95000 about I believe), my case is similar to this one I believe in many aspects], so the legal aid office could have assigned a lawyer to help me make such a demand to the French government, even if it is rarely granted [I wrote recently to M. Holland and to the US Ambassador to France to ask for their help to resolve this problem, but they have not responded so far ([exh. 19](#))]. The legal aid office decision to reject my application on this case was therefore **not correct and not fair**; and it deprived me of my chance to obtain justice **because of the obligation to be represented by a lawyer in such case**. But, even if the legal aid office behaved very badly, the culprit is (as I explained above) also the legal aid system because to prepare such a complaint, one must know the US laws and regulations and the French laws, and study a lot of facts over a 10 years period, and therefore one need a lot of time, so no (private) lawyer would accept to prepare and file such a complaint for less than \$20 000 as down payment, **while the legal aid system pays only \$800 or \$900** (after the case went to trial) !

The legal aid application for the criminal complaint with civil part petition.

(55) The legal aid office also rejected (at first) my legal aid application to write the criminal complaint with civil part petition, **supposedly because I did not give the jurisdiction**, which was not true ; as mentioned above, I had given a jurisdiction (a lawyer had told me to give!) and even complained that they had no right to force me to give this information [please see the letter to the Appeal Court President ([exh. 26.1](#)), his response, and the response and denial decision from the legal aid office ([exh. 26.2](#))]. Later it did grant me the legal aid for a special proceeding to try to obtain the documents of the case that the bank had refused to give me, but the assigned lawyer did not want to tell me how much time the legal aid paid for such case and how much time she would spend on the case; she also told me legal information that were not correct. Finally, we could not agree on how we should organize ourselves to do the work (again the aid pays almost nothing, so I offered to do some work, but she refused), so she withdrew from the case. I wrote to the head of the lawyers' association on 30-5-12 to tell him all the problems I had also encountered with the legal aid office and with the lawyers I had been in contact with ; and I told him that I

would file a complaint at the ECHR to denounce the unfairness of the legal aid system, and asked him if he would accept to help me write it. I also asked him to appoint other lawyers to help me in my various cases and asked him few questions about the legal aid system, **but he did not respond at first**. And then in August 2013, he only assigned one lawyer to help me with my criminal case, but this lawyer took his time to invite me for an appointment, and then he did not show up at the appointment without any notice or excuse, and finally he did not respond to my letters and emails, so I had to ask the head of the lawyers' association to appoint someone else, **but he refused !**

(56) The refusal to appoint another lawyer to help me from the head of the lawyers' association **was a serious problem for me, of course**, especially when you know that he lied on the reasons why he refused to appoint another lawyer in his letter [see my letters ([exh. 27.1](#)), his responses ([exh. 27.2](#)) and my last 12-311-2012 letter ([exh. 27.3](#))]; he was trying to make me responsible for the fact that the lawyer did not show up at the meeting and did not respond to my letters, which was very unfair, even if the legal aid system is obviously dishonest [you are entitled by law to be helped by a lawyer in front of the investigating judge, so refusing to appoint a lawyer deprives you of your right; and as I told you, in many other cases, it is an obligation to be represented by a lawyer] ! Here again to understand this lawyer's behavior (**even if he has no excuse for his behavior**), you have to know that the legal aid pays only \$400 about for such case although a lawyer needs probably more than two weeks of time over a year or two on such a case, so they loose at least **7200 euros** if they work fast and are specialized in such case, and they cannot afford to accept such case [it took me about **5 months** of full-time work to write my two criminal complaints, the one at the DA and the one for the investigating judge, so even a lawyer, **who necessarily works faster than me**, would need at least two weeks because the complaint is technically complex (even if it is obvious that I was victim of an injustice). This type of complaint is technically fairly complicated and time consuming because it refers to many facts (over a 20 years period), and to many areas of law (criminal law, business law, civil law, consumer law, banking law,...), and for some of the issues there are what we call a 'vide juridique' (juridical emptiness), the law is not precise enough yet, so you must look at specific cases (jurisprudence) to prove the criminal offense. Moreover, in criminal cases in which you must prove the *intend* to hurt the victim and to commit a criminal offense, it is important to know the appropriate legal authorities because it is often the only way to prove what they call the '*moral element*' of the offense (or even some times the 'material element' of the offense), so even when you are a lawyer expert in the field, it takes time to prepare **seriously** such a complaint, and the legal aid system pays only few hours of work at a low rate (as we have seen) for this type of complaint (in the US a lawyer would ask for **\$10 000 down payment minimum** just to start working on such a case, I believe). For the poor it is risky to prepare and file alone such a lawsuit because you always risk to be charged with '*calumnious denunciation*' if your legal theory is wrong, this why I tried to address every legal issues of the case and to support every allegations with appropriate legal authorities and why it took me a lot of time to write the complaint.].

The complaint at the ECHR and the new application for legal aid to denounce all the legal aid problems I encountered.

(57) I must write briefly about the complaint at the ECHR that I filed on 8-8-12 ([exh. 24.1](#)). I described the various problems I had and used the denial decisions of the legal aid office and the conclusions of the Senator's report to explain to the ECHR that the legal aid system violates the fundamental rights of the poor (article 6, 13, 14 of the ECHR), but even though there are only few grounds to justify that a petition is not admissible, the ECHR rendered an unmotivated decision on 15-11-12 ([exh. 24.2](#)). You understand the situation I was in, the ECHR refuses to motivate its denial decision, the newly assigned lawyer misses the appointment he gives me and does not respond to my letters and emails, and the lawyers' association lies to make me responsible for the problems I had, **to refuse to appoint another lawyer** ; all this is very dishonest because they simply deprive me of my right to a fair trial **in all my proceedings** and/or simply of my right to access the justice without any

honest and clear explanation, justification or motivation. So I had to file a new application for legal aid to **denounce all these problems in front of the French courts**, but this time the defendants had to be **(1) the legal aid office** (and some of its employees), **(2) the lawyers' association** (and some of its employees), **(3) some of the lawyers** who were assigned to help me, and **(4) the French government** for maintaining a dishonest of the legal aid system. I did file it on January 3 2013 ([exh. 23.1](#)) and explained that I did not know in which jurisdiction I had to file this complaint and that I had asked the lawyers' association and that they had not responded, but the legal aid office took more than 4 months to respond (see its denial decision that I received on May 20 2013, [exh. 23.2](#)) and again it said that I did not give the jurisdiction and did not present clear and precise facts. It also assigned the administrative court as jurisdiction.

(58) Of course I immediately appealed the decision **on 6-4-13** ([exh. 23.3](#)), to explain **(1) that the facts** I presented were precisely described (I had given a copy of my complaint at the ECHR and described the more recent facts precisely and attached the letters of the lawyers' association...), and **(2)** that the dishonest behaviors I described were coherent with the fact that the legal aid system paid too little and was dishonest for the poor, even if these behaviors were unforgettable, of course. The legal aid office immediately acknowledged my appeal ([exh. 23.4](#)), and said **that it forwarded it to the President of the Administrative Appeal Court in Bordeaux**, but they waited more than four months (October 2013) to send the documents to Bordeaux according to what I was told, and recently (on 11-25-13) the President of the Bordeaux AA Court ruled ([exh. 23.5](#)) that the legal aid office **made a mistake of 'jurisdiction'** when it assigned the case to the administrative court because according to him the case should have been assigned **to the judiciary court** ! Almost a year has passed and I still don't have a decision on my legal aid application to denounce the dishonesty of the legal aid office, the lawyers... and the legal aid system (!) **although it affects everyone of the proceedings I have in front of the court or I would like to have.** And as I told you above the 'procureur general' (attorney general) to whom I described these problems also on 6-5-13 (I copied her the then recent decision of the legal aid office and my appeal) and to whom **I formally complained against X for harassment** in the context of my legal aid applications (a criminal offense), did not respond either to my letter at this day although it affects my ongoing criminal case which she (her office) should be handling !

My letters to The Minister of Justice (Mrs. Taubira), to the French parliament and to Mr. Hollande .

(59) In March 2013, I decided to write to the Minister of Justice, Mrs. Taubira, and to the Labor Minister, Mr. Sapin, and copied the letter to the heads of political groups in the French National Assembly ([exh. 13.1](#)) **(1)** to explain the problems I described you here, **(2)** to describe my dispute with the unemployment agency, and **(3)** to describe my work for the international community (including my application for the UNSG post and my plate-form of proposals to support it), and of course I asked for their help to resolve the problems I had. Unfortunately, apart from the head of the communist group who wrote me a short letter saying that he (his group) fought hard to decrease the injustices and inequalities that increased regularly, without addressing the arguments I gave ([exh. 13.2](#)), they did not respond. So I wrote again **(1)** to them at the end of April ([exh. 15](#)) to ask them if they could comment publicly my critics on the legal aid system; and I wrote also **(2)** to the press and media (this time, [exh. 16.1](#), I sent the letter

to more than 15 newspapers) to present my work and my proposals, and to ask them to give a chance to politicians to comment publicly my remarks on the unfairness of the legal aid system which affects quite a few people, **but again they did not respond**. I wrote at the same time to MM. Holland and Ayrault ([exh. 14](#)) to describe my work, to ask them to admit that the legal aid system violates the fundamental rights of the poor, and to ask them for their help in finding solutions to the various legal problems I had, but they did not respond either. On June 18 2013, I wrote again to Mrs. Taubira, the Minister of Justice ([exh. 17](#)) **(1)** to forward her the letter I had written on 6-5-13 to the 'procureur general' of Poitiers to describe all the problems in my criminal case, **(2)** to ask for her help to resolve these problems because she is the head of all the General Attorneys (procureur general) and DAs (procureur de la republique), and she can order investigations [in this case where two of the suspects are a big Bank and his CEO and the dishonesty of the legal aid system is an important issue, she can play and should play a special role, and should be concerned, I believe], **(3)** to ask her also to admit that the legal aid system violates the rights of the poor, and **(4)** to present her the solution I gave you above, but she still did not respond at this day although her response is critical for the honesty of all my proceedings.

(60) Finally, at the end of August 2013, I wrote again to Mr. Hollande ([exh. 18](#)) to keep him informed on the development of my legal cases and to ask him for his help to find a settlement for the different cases because they are all related in some ways, and the administration and the unfairness of the legal aid system are **at the center of every things**. I also wrote to him about the report of eminent persons as you could see above. But here again he did not respond. In September I wrote to MM. Obama and Hollande to talk about the Syrian problem and about the effort by France and the US to bomb Syria ([exh. 19](#)), and I wrote to the US Ambassador to ask for his help also to try to resolve the legal problems I have with the US because as you know and I explained above, it is difficult to file a lawsuit against a country and its civil servants in foreign courts because of the immunity (and especially when you are poor), and of course given the work that I have done, I would rather find a friendly settlement than fighting in court against the US, but he (they) did not respond either. The famous economist John Kenneth Galbraith wrote an article called '*the art of ignoring the poor*' published in 1985 in Harper's Magazine, I believe, and there is no doubt that, in France, we have great masters at this art which must be the 8th art, if the 7th art is the art of making movies. If the politicians are mainly responsible for our problems of society, we see here that in France, several important parts of the society (the press and media, the civil servants, the intellectuals, the politicians,) contributes to the efforts to send so many people into poverty in any way possible and to the increase of inequalities.

My poverty, the job search strategy recommended by the unemployment agency, and my application for UNSG.

(61) Some cynical persons would probably tell you that if I am so poor, it is because I am lazy, I did not look for work actively, and I only want to become UN Secretary General, but this is not true, and I believe you know it is not true. The early professional experiences I had and the proposals I made to the international community demonstrate that I have worked hard; and of course my studies in the US that I paid myself represent also a serious work, so I am not lazy. And I sent thousands and thousands of job applications, and

even went to work in Germany in 94 where the unemployment rate was lower, so I was not afraid of moving to work and I accepted lower salaries than the ones I had had. Finally, the work that I have done on my unemployment project also shows you that I looked for work **very actively** and very seriously since I followed rigorously the strategy that I was asked to follow by the unemployment agency [my unemployment project was a complex technical project, perhaps, but, obviously, it fitted perfectly the training and the experience I had obtained, see the first chapter of my book ([exh. 6.2](#)) and my project proposal at [exh. 12.1](#), [exh. 12.2](#), [exh. 12.3](#)], and if we look at the letters of support I received from the international experts and at the good evaluation from the EU, we can say that I understood the problem well and that I was able to present a fair solution to it. Then given the letters of support I obtained and the importance of the project for everyone, it was normal that (and even showed a strong sense of responsibility when) I continue (d) working on the project to guide me in my job search, and normal that I address more general issues to try to realize it, including management issues, **so the 2006 UNSG application came naturally**, and it only showed that I worked hard on the subject I had chosen. Given the first part of this letter and the adequation between my profile and the one some of you wanted the UNSG to have in 2006 (see [exh. 2](#), [exh. 18](#)), my work was serious and useful ('you' and the panel of eminent persons came to share my point of view as seen in part A), **so my UNSG application is reasonable and justified**.

(62) I did nothing wrong in my job search, nothing that can justify **(1)** that I live so many years under the poverty level [I have lived under the poverty level in France (and in the US) **since mid 97 about**] and **(2)** that I be deprived of justice as I was in France and the US. On the other hand, all the evidences support that France behaved badly. Without talking about the many corruption scandals France had in the 90s, including the one I was victim of, **the proofs are unequivocal** : as seen above, **(1)** France has increased significantly the number (already high) of its citizens living under the poverty level between 2001 - **7,3 millions** - and now more than **8,7 millions**; and at the same time **(2)** it has doubled the fortune of its richest citizens [Mme Bettencourt from \$15,2 billions in 2000, to \$30 billions today; M. Arnault from \$12,6 billions to \$29 billions, ...]; **(3)** it has maintained a legal aid system that violates the fundamental rights of the poor despite at least my complaint on the subject at the ECHR (in 2001) and in France also; **(4)** it has threatened, persecuted and kept out of work one its **conscientious** employee (me) who has obviously done many efforts to find work, to obtain justice, and to help resolve some of our complex global problems, and **(5)** it did not decrease its greenhouse gazes emissions sufficiently enough to meet the UN recommendations and did not fulfill its engagements in term of ODA (which hurt the poor around the world greatly). All this although at the same time the UN was doing **a special 15 years effort to reduce the number of very poor around the world and to fight global warming** (and at the same time China was taking out of extreme poverty 680 millions of the 730 millions persons who had the chance to exit extreme poverty). There is no doubt '**France has been caught the hand in the bag**', (and the US too, I believe, since it has hurt the poor at home, and in developing countries, and hurt the environment ...while it increases the inequalities by letting its richest citizens double their already large fortunes..); and if 'we' want to have a chance to achieve our objectives in 2030, including the eradication of extreme poverty, **(1)** 'we' ('you') **must absolutely point that out**, and **(2)** **all the countries must work (and push) in the same direction**, in particular the richest and most advanced countries (and especially the 5 permanent members of the UN Security Council) that must show the example and assume their special intellectual responsibility.

E Conclusion.

(63) The report on the post-2015 development agenda showed that the priorities and the objective of eradication of extreme poverty I identified in my 2006 UNSG application were relevant and that the proposals I used to support my application are **still critical today**. And our results on the MDGs, in particular the fact that China has achieved – almost alone - the objective to half the proportion of extremely poor by 2015, while the rest of the world probably added around 350 millions very poor, show us **(1) that we planed badly the MDGs**, and **(2)** that we lacked a set of global actions like the ones I propose to help all the countries achieve their goals. The UN estimates that there will be about **1,3 billions** of extremely poor in 2015, more than we had in 2000, so we still have **an enormous task** ahead of us to eradicate extreme poverty, especially in the context of our worsening environmental situation. I therefore suggest that, in addition to the preparation of **(a)** the post 2015 development goals and targets and **(b)** of the contributions in greenhouse gazes emissions reduction to address the global warming problem, we prepare during 2014 (and in early 2015) the set of proposals I presented you, so that you can vote on their realization during the 2015 UN September summit.

(64) In December 2015 in Paris, countries have to agree on the efforts that they must make to fight global warming and as you know, the UN wants that countries find *a legally binding agreement* to reduce their greenhouse gazes emissions. But as you and the international community seem to understand well according **(a)** to the recent post 2015 development report and **(b)** to the timing and objectives of the two 2015 summits, **our post 2015 development objectives** (planned efforts, obligations.) **are indissociable from** our greenhouses gazes emissions reduction objectives (efforts, contributions, obligations, in term gazes emissions reduction and financial aid given to mitigate the effect of global warming...), and an - honest and good for the world - *legally binding agreement* on global warming will be very difficult to find if there are **(a)** no form of obligation on the post 2015 development objectives and **(b)** no global agreement on the set of global actions or projects (I recommend) to make sure that all the countries achieve their goals [the failure to reach a good agreement in 2009 in Copenhagen and the differences in point of view (between the group of 77 plus China and developed countries) that were expressed in the recent Warsaw summit on climate change in November 2013 have confirmed this, I believe.], so I urge you to create a working group to prepare the actions I propose and to make sure that we reach a good global agreement on these different, but indissociable, topics in 2015.

(65) We cannot properly estimate the amount of money that is to be given by rich countries to poor countries to fight the consequences of global warming **before** we have agreed on the efforts and the type of global actions we must make to achieve our goals (and it is also very negative to talk about the consequences of global warming **while we still can prevent them** and **we still should be doing more to prevent them**). There are several ways rich countries can help poor countries to achieve their objectives : for example if we create a new Internet IO and develop global computer applications that can be used by all countries, and this work is mostly financed by rich countries and/or rich individuals from rich countries, it would be a form of financial aid given to poor countries that would be very valuable [similarly, the development and implementation of an alternative to market capitalism that would remunerate the people more in relation to their relative contribution to society's progress while respecting our environmental, our social and human rights constraints would also

be of tremendous help to poor countries], so it is urgent and imperative to prepare the set of proposals I presented you from now to mid 2015. If 'we' do **not** start now the preparation of these proposals, 'we' will **not** be able to vote on them and then start their realization in 2015-2016; while if 'we' prepare them in 2014, we will still be able to give up a specific proposal in 2015 if a major problem arises.

(66) Again the plate-form of proposals I presented you is coherent and each proposal addresses **several of the priorities identified** by the group of eminent persons [for example, the creation of a new Internet IO addresses priorities 1 (eradication of extreme poverty, '*a new agenda that must tackle the causes of poverty, exclusion, and inequalities*', in developing computer applications that can be used by every country), 3 (transformation of economies... since it allows us to develop of our new economic system), 2 (put sustainable development at the core by allowing us to realize our poverty reduction and climate change objectives) and even 4 (build peace and effective, open, and accountable public institutions, in allowing us to improve of our justice systems (including the improvement of our legal aid system)]. I asked France (Mr. Hollande) to take the lead on the development of a new legal aid system, and to reform the French legal aid system **in front of the UN**, so that every other countries in the world can benefit from the experience and the possible global computer applications France would develop to support our reform [every country has the same constraints which are mainly our human rights and the budget limits, so we can develop a system that is acceptable for everyone]. For France it is a little more difficult to do its reform in front of the UN than doing a reform on its own since, for example, it should study the possibility to develop global computer applications that can be used by all the other countries, but the benefits for the international communities would be tremendous. More generally, I believe that **given the enormous task ahead of us**, every countries should (when possible) think the resolution of its problems in the context of our global goals (see [exh. 19](#)).

(67) In his 7-26-13 report M. Ban Ki-moon proposed you a planing to prepare the 2015 UN summit, but he did not include any effort to prepare global projects that could help every countries reach its objectives, so I must encourage you to correct this oversight and to ask him to include the creation of a working group to prepare the main proposals I presented you and to include **the preparation** of the different proposals [design the planing of their realization, study their cost, find the financing, prepare the coordination, study the impact on the realization of our development objectives , ...] **for and the discussion** on their pertinence and feasibility **in the September 2015 UN summit**, so that you can vote on their realization during the summit. Personally, I believe also that **2015 would be a good time for Mr. Ban Ki-moon to ask you to replace him** and to find a new UN Secretary General to guide the UN during the first five (early 2016 to end of 2020) and (even if possible) ten years of effort to achieve our goals; I have already talked to you about the importance of time and about showing more respect toward the new generation, and recommended to impose age limits on countries leaders and IO chiefs, and Mr. Ban Ki-moon has a chance to pass the 'baton' to the new generation in 2015 (as we say in sport) and to show the example on this issue. Time is a critical concern to eradicate extreme poverty and also to fight global warming, so we need to encourage everyone to think about it. I, of course, would be happy to work with you, so I offer you again my service to prepare and to realize the proposals I presented you.

(68) **At the end of this century, in 2099**, people will look back on the century and will try to point out the year that was the most important year of this century for the world, and I believe that without any hesitation they will say **2014 was the most important year of this 21st century** because it was the year the UN and its 193 member states **prepared (1)** the post 2015 development agenda that planned the eradication of extreme poverty on the planet, **(2)** the greenhouse gazes emissions targets that led to **the first** legally binding agreement and **the first common global effort** to curb the effect of greenhouse gazes emissions on global warming, and **(3) the first global strategy**, set of global actions, which led **(a)** to the end of the 2 century old and obsolete economic system (market capitalism), **(b)** to the creation of new Internet International Organization, **(c)** to the eradication of extreme poverty and (d) to the control of greenhouse gazes emissions. But for this to happen, you must act urgently in early 2014 to create the working group and to include these topics in the 2015 UN summit agenda.

(69) I know that most of the leaders did not realize that they would have to take so many important decisions for the world in 2014 and 2015 when they were chosen for their country's highest job ; Mr. Hollande, for example, did not say to the French people during his presidential campaign in 2012: *'you must elect me President so that I can make propositions to the UN to eradicate extreme poverty around the world and to control greenhouse gazes emissions between 2015 and 2030; and indirectly help France resolve some its recurrent and grave problems...'* ; although (he could have since) the resolution of many of our grave national problems **is directly dependent on the resolution of our global problems**. No one in France has even talked publicly about the post-2105 development agenda report (! as I mentioned above), but it is still time to act, and *'you'* can play an important role to convince the world leaders to act, so I wish you a very happy and productive 2014, and also, of course, a merry Christmas. I would be grateful to Mr. Ashe if he could forward this letter to all the permanent representatives of member states that I was not able to reach [I may not be able to email it or mail it to everyone]. I look forward to hearing from you and remain

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Geneviev

PS: I put the exhibits of the letter on a new site, so they should be available to you now, but if one is not for some reason and you need it, please let me know and I will forward you a pdf copy by email.

Exhibits:

Letters and proposals for the UN

- exh. 1: Letter to the UNGA dated 12-1-11, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/letungaBP-Pre1-12-11-4.pdf>].
- exh. 2: UNSG application dated 6-14-06, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/ungeneralassemb.pdf>].
- exh. 3 : Letter to the UNGA dated 29-11-05, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/uscongress10-20.pdf>].
- exh. 4 : Letter to the UNGA dated 4-5-05, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/let5-4-05.htm>].
- exh. 5: Lettre to M. Bloomberg dated 3-25-08, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/letblo3-25-08.pdf>] ;
- exh. 6: Book proposal (6.1, 15 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Book-Proposal-v3-1-10-11.pdf>] ;
Introduction and first chapter (6.2, 36 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/intro+chap1-9-14-10.pdf>].

- exh. 8: Letter to the UNGA dated 23-6-10 (72 p.) [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/letunga6-23-10.pdf>].
- exh. 9: Post 2015 development report (64 p.), [http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/UN_Report-2015-dev-goal.pdf].
- exh. 10: SDS Network report (62 pages), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/SDSN-Action-for-Sustain-Deve-6-6-13.pdf>].
- exh. 11: M. Ban Ki-moon 7-26-13 report (24 p.) ; [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Rapport-ban-kimoon-26-7-13.pdf>].
- exh. 12: INCO project proposal (12.1, 31 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/incoproposal7-1-11.pdf>].
EU evaluation and some letters of interest (12.2, 20 p.) [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/incopropanletsup1.pdf>]
and (12.3) [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/incoletsup2.pdf>].
- exh. 13: Letter to Mrs. Taubira and Mr. Sapin, 18-3-13 (13.1, 8 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/letaubira-18-3-13.pdf>],
Response from Mr. Chassaigne 15-4-13 (13.2, 1 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/repchassaigne-15-4-13.pdf>].
- exh. 14: Letter to MM. Hollande and Ayrault, 25-4-13 (5 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-pres-pm-1-25-4-13.pdf>].
- exh. 15: Lettre to Mrs. Taubira and M. Sapin, 25-4-13 (4 p.); [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-ministre-depute-2-25-4-13.pdf>].
- exh. 16: Letter to Libération, 25-4-13 (16.1, 21 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-liberation-2-25-4-13.pdf>] ;
Press (Express) article on Mrs. Taubira (16.2, 2 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/art-express-27-3-13.pdf>] ;
Press (Le Monde) article on Mr. Zuckerberg (16.3, 2 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/art-lemonde-23-10-13.pdf>].
- exh. 17: Letter to Mrs. Taubira, 18-6-13 (6 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/letaubira-3-18-6-13.pdf>].
- exh. 18: Letter to MM. Hollande, Ayrault..., 28-8-13 (11 p.); [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-pres-pm-sap-2-28-8-13.pdf>].
- exh. 19: Letter to MM. Hollande and Obama, 9-13-13 (7 p.); [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-holla-obama-3-13-9-13.pdf>].

Judgment from the administrative court and legal request related documents

- exh. 20: Judgment TA of Poitiers, 17-7-13 (6 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/jug-ta-vs-pe-17-7-13.pdf>].
- exh. 21: Senator du Luart's report 2007, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/rapportduluart.pdf>] ;
- exh. 22: Letter to M. Piveteau, CE, 18-3-13 (12 pages), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-piveteau-ce-18-3-13.pdf>].
- exh. 23: Legal aid application at the CE, 3-10-12 (23.1, 5 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/aidju-8-poleemploi-refere-CE-3-10-12-2.pdf>] ;
Letter granting the aid, 16-10-12 (23.2, 2 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-BAJ-CE-16-10-12.pdf>] ;
Conseil d'Etat decision, 6-2-13 (23.3, 5 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-CE-6-2-13.pdf>].
- exh. 24: ECHR Petition, 10-8-12 (24.1, 12 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Plaintevsfrance-cedh-8-8-12-2.pdf>] ;
ECHR decision (24.2, 1 p.) [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/dec-cedh-15-11-12.pdf>].
- exh. 25: Last legal aid application, 3-1-13 (25.1, 3 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/demande-AJ-poitiers-3-1-13.pdf>] ;
LAO's decision, 26-4-13 (25.2, 2 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/BAJ-dec-26-4-13.pdf>] ;
appeal of the decision (25.3, 5p.) [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/appele-rejet-demAJdemai-2-31-5-13.pdf>] ;
acknowledgment of receipt (25.4, 1 p.) [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/BAJ-AC-4-6-13.pdf>] ;
CAA of Bordeaux's decision (25.5, 3p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/CAA-bordeaux-BAJ-dec-25-11-13.pdf>].
- exh. 26: Letter to M. Main, 27-10-11 (26.1, 2 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/ACpres-plainte-2-10-27-11.pdf>] ;
his response (26.2, 1 p.), response form LAO (26.3, 1 p.), and decision from LAO, 19-1-12 (26.4, 1 p.)
[<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Main-baj-let-et-dec-9-11-11.pdf>].
- exh. 27: Letter to the lawyer's association, 20-9-12 (1 p.); Letter from M. Wozniak du 28-9-12 (1. p); letters to M. Wozniak du 1-10-12 (2 p.) (27.1), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/lets-wozniak-20et28-9-12-et-1-10-12.pdf>] ;
letters from the lawyer's association (27.2, 1 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-du-bat-10-10-12et17-1-13.pdf>] ;
letter to the lawyer's association, 31-12-12 (27.3, 3 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Batonnier-Bouyssi-6-31-12-12-2.pdf>].

Deportation order and related documents

- exh. 28: Full of lies deportation order, 10-1-08, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/deportorder1-11-08.pdf>].
- exh. 29: Acknowledgment of receipt of asylum application 14-5-02 (1 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/asylumappliakreci5-14-2.pdf>].
- exh. 30: Refugee Verification of Status dated 9-5-02 (2 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf/verifstat9-5-02s.pdf>].
- exh. 31: ALJ Tolenino's decision dated 2-5-03 (6 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/aljtoleninodoc2-5-03-2.pdf>].
- exh. 32: A03 refugee EA card 12-10-04 (32.1, 3 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/pdf/eacard12-10-04+explication.pdf>].
A3 EA card 12-04-08 with explanation (32.2, 3 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/htm/refeacard12-3-08-2.pdf>].

Criminal complaint with civil part petition

- exh. 33: Complaint with civil part petition (1er page, plus page 5, and pages 24 et 25 (33.1),
[<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/plainte-acpc-p1-5-24-25-depo-3-12-12.pdf>] ;
table of contents, exhibits (33.2, 2 p.); [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/Table-matiere-PACPC-29-11-12.pdf>].
calcul du préjudice (33.3, 2 p.); [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/cacul-dommage-final-29-11-12-1.pdf>].
- exh. 34: Réquisitoire du procureur, DA's order, 11-2-13 (1 p.) ; [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/requisitoire-11-2-13.pdf>].
- exh. 35: Letter to procureur general, 6-5-13 (1 p.) ; [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/pages-tablematieres-planquelle-5-6-13.pdf>].
- exh. 36: Letter to the judge, 31-5-13 (4 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-jugeinstruction-3-31-5-13.pdf>].
- exh. 37: Requête en nullité, 19-7-13 (37.1, 18 p.); [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-pres-chambre-instruction-1-18-7-13-3.pdf>].
admissibility decision (37.2, 3 p.) ; [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-pres-ch-instruction-dec-admin-1-9-10-13.pdf>].
Letter to procureur general, 23-12-13 (37.3, 5 p.) ; [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-progen-3-23-12-13.pdf>].
- exh. 38: Change of venue request, 19-8-13 (18 p.) ; [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/req-suspi-legitime-cha-crim-1-20-8-13.pdf>] ;
letter to CC President 23-12-13 (38.2, 3 p.), [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/req-suspi-leg-2-23-12-13-2.pdf>].
- exh. 39: 2nd Change of venue request, (2 pages) ; [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-progen-req-renvoi-2-20-8-13.pdf>].
- exh. 40: Mise en demeure de payer d'Intrum du 23-3-11, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/mise-demeure-23-3-11.pdf>].
- exh. 41: Letter from CACF datée du 17-1-12, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-ca-bruot-17-1-12.pdf>].
- exh. 42: Letter from CACF datée, 13-6-12, [<http://www.pierregenevier.eu/npdf2/let-ca-bruot-13-6-12.pdf>].

Table of contents

A The report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, and the preparation of 'global actions' for 2015.	P. 2
1) <i>The report's priorities compared to the priorities mentioned in my 2006 UNSG application.</i>	P. 2
2) <i>Our results on the MDG and the important work to be done before September 2015. Even if 'we' achieved the first goal, the result shows that we planned badly and that the world, apart from China, failed. M. Ban Ki-moon's intermediate report dated 7-26-13 and his planning until 2015.</i>	P. 5
3) <i>The main proposals of the plate-form. First, the search for the alternative to market capitalism. Then the creation of a new Internet IO and the development of a new legal aid system.</i>	P. 8
B The reform of our legal aid systems, one of the keys to eradicate extreme poverty and to make our institutions more accountable toward the poor.	P. 11
1) <i>The legal aid systems in France and the obligation to be represented by a lawyer to present most of the complaint in courts. The lawyers in France finance 'in theory' more than 60% of the legal aid missions ! My administrative complaint against the unemployment agency and a practical example of legal aid mission. An extrapolation which leaves no doubt that the system violates the fundamental rights of the poor.</i>	P. 11
2) <i>The legal aid system in the US, the objectives of an efficient legal aid system and possible solution to the problems. The systems in the US and in France are different, but the result is similar : the poor and society suffer. Senator du Luart's proposals, the objective of a good legal aid system, and another possible solution to the problem.</i>	P. 16
3) <i>Some human problems and the consequences of the flawed legal aid system.</i>	P. 18
C The deportation from the US on 2-3-11, the criminal complaint 'with civil part petition', and the efforts to denounce the unfair legal aid system.	P. 20
1) <i>A very unfair and inhuman deportation from the US on February 3rd 2011. A deportation order full-of-lies and a criminal behavior. An inhuman deportation on dishonest and outrageous grounds. The \$ 10 millions lawsuit against the SSA The third lawsuit against the LA County in which it defaulted twice.</i>	P. 20
2) <i>My criminal complaint for forgery, obstruction of justice, breach of banking secrecy, concealment, ... against several parties including a big French bank and its CEO. An unusual story which confirms the well-founded of my refugee status. The criminal complaint with 'civil part petition'. The hostile behavior of the investigating judge during the audition and my application for invalidity of the audition, the DA order, and the missing investigation.</i>	P. 24
3) <i>The various problems I had with the legal aid office, the lawyers' association, and the designated lawyers, and the efforts I made to denounce the dishonesty of the legal aid system. First, my legal aid application to file a complaint against the US. The legal aid requests for the criminal complaint 'civil part petition'. The complaint at the ECHR and the application for legal aid to denounce all the legal aid problems I encountered. My letters to The Minister of Justice (Mrs. Taubira), to the French parliament, and to Mr. Hollande. My poverty, the job search strategy recommended by the unemployment agency, and my application for UNSG.</i>	P. 28
D Conclusion.	P. 34
Exhibits:	P. 36
Table of contents	P. 38