

Pierre Genevier
711 South Westlake Ave. #205
Los Angeles, CA 90057-4128
Ph.: (213) 422-1520
Email: pierre.genevier@laposte.net

H.E. Mr. Joseph Deiss, 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
MM. Barack Obama, US President and Nicolas Sarkozy, President of France
Mrs. Pelosi, and MM. Reid, McConnell, and Boehner, US Congress leaders
Mr. Bloomberg, New York Mayor

Los Angeles, January 12 2011

Object: My previous letters; application for the United Nations Secretary-General job (UNSG); and book proposal '*Application for the UNSG job*'.

Dear Mr. Joseph Deiss,
Dear Mrs./Mr. Permanent Representatives of UN Member States,
Dear Mr. Ban Ki-moon,
Dear MM. Barack Obama and Nicolas Sarkozy,
Dear Mrs. Pelosi and MM. Reid, McConnell and Boehner,
Dear Mr. Michael Bloomberg,

Referring to my letter dated 6-23-10 [[exh. 2](#)] concerning my application for the UN Secretary-General job, I take the liberty of writing you again **(1)** to present you a book proposal describing the book I am working on to support my application, and **(2)** to offer you to make some comments on the book or simply to encourage its writing to facilitate the publication. I also would like **(3)** to make few additional comments on the issues I have addressed in my previous letters and **(4)** to present you a proposed planning for 2011.

The book proposal's contents and my application for the UNSG job.

During the **past 11 years** about I have written to 'you' (UNGA Member State Representatives), to G8 Country Leaders and to IO Chiefs **(1)** to present you the computer project proposal I and 5 partners submitted to the Inco-Copernicus program in 1997, **(2)** to discuss some important global issues, and **(3)** to describe the related-to-my-work-difficulties I encountered in France and later in the US. And I am now writing a book to bring you I hope more precise arguments in the various subjects I discussed and more references to my research and readings. I also believe that it is important to explain to the people of the world what 'we' want to do and why 'we' want to do it, and/or to give the international community a written basis for a public debate on the various proposals I presented you because they have not been properly discussed publicly, if at all, unfortunately.

The attached book proposal [exh. 1] gives you a fairly detailed description of each chapter contents and of my objectives, and other standard information required in this type of document intended for publishers. I have not yet sold the book or even finished the manuscript since I have just written the first draft copy, but I had to give you a preview and to ask you if you would like to receive a copy of the manuscript. I thought that perhaps you would like to comment some parts of the book, in particular the parts dealing with your effort to reform UNSG selection process and with the platform of proposals I submitted to you. Your comments that could be added to the book could help everyone in the world and perhaps give ideas to future UNSG candidates. Beginner writers like me must usually write the manuscript before they can write a professional book proposal, so my book proposal is still imperfect because I still have several corrections of the draft copy to make to finish the manuscript, and I hope you will not pay too much attention to the imperfections of the book proposal.

I perfectly understand that it may seem strange for some of you and many others that a very poor Frenchman refugee in the US applies for the UNSG job, but if you think about it just a little, it is **not** so much my application that should be surprising [especially after you read the book and know about the intellectual process that led me to apply], but the fact that no rich and/or advanced country like the US or France makes any effort to present a candidate and a platform of proposals aiming at improving the situation of the world. Rich and/or advanced countries have all the research capacities and resources necessary to develop platforms of proposals that could help us resolve our global problems, so if they had a genuine interest in making the world a better place to live for everyone including themselves, they would and should make the effort to at least try to design (and submit) platforms they feel a large majority of countries could accept.

If they don't, it is simply because they have no genuine interest in improving the situation of the world and their lack of effort is, to me, **close to** a crime against humanity, if it is not simply a crime against humanity. To present a platform of proposals that can be accepted by all countries is difficult without any doubt. I know or hear about the tensions around the world; I can understand that many of you have very different perceptions of what is a perfect society; and I can easily imagine the difficulties of your work, but not trying to reach an agreement on few important issues that we know could help the world in the long term, especially for the very advanced countries, is unacceptable. The unwritten rule preventing the permanent members of the UN Security Council from presenting UNSG candidates is **not** in everyone's interest and should be changed because it excuses these 5 countries' failure to assume their responsibilities and exonerates them for not making any significant effort to resolve our global problems.

The platform of proposals and the importance of paying careful attention to the 'time factor'.

There is no doubt that there is a better chance of convincing everyone of the pertinence of a platform if the platform points out weaknesses of global importance in the country (or countries) where the candidate comes from, and/or if the platform requires an equal share of effort from everyone. I suggest improvement of the justice system in rich countries, but I come from a rich country, I have lived in the US for the past 9 years and I am a victim of the US justice system flaws. And the platform asks for an equal share of efforts to address the environment and poverty problems. I don't think that rich

countries, in particular the US, would be disadvantaged by the proposals if you all, including the US, approved the platform I presented you because the improvement of the US institutions and justice system, for example, is **long overdue**, and to address the income inequality and the Internet governance problems is urgent for the US too as well as the need to **significantly** reduce the US GHG emissions.

In my first few letters in 1999 and 2000, I stressed the importance of paying careful attention to the ‘*time factor*’ and of showing respect toward the new generation to defeat poverty, and proposed to limit at 65 the age of country leaders and IO chiefs to, among other, encourage everyone to do so. I came back several times on this issue since then and in my 6-23-10 letter I talked about a possible 70 age limit for US Supreme Court Justices and Congress members, and explained that the ECHR already had such a 70 limit for its judges. At the end of the 70s, the Australian government organized a referendum on this issue to change the constitution and to create a 70 age limit for its federal judges also, I believe, and **80% of the voters supported the change!** This result shows, I believe, that the people can and would understand the importance of such age limit proposal if they are and were presented with a clear question and clear arguments.

To me this result also explains **in part** why I had so much difficulties in France and then here after I talked about this age limit for high level national and international officials in 2000 because it shows that the high level politicians who do not (or do not want in the future to) impose this limit on themselves, know that the age limit proposal would be well understood by voters, and do not want to see anyone explaining the benefits of such limit and requesting changes on the issue. The ‘*time factor*’ is still critical to defeat poverty and it is also now critical to resolve our environment problems, so my proposal is still important for everyone and **I must again encourage Mr. Ban Ki-moon to explain its importance to everyone by refusing to run for a second term** (independently from the UNGA decision on my application). Mr. Ban Ki-moon, you have had an incredible career and there is no doubt that you can still contribute to the world progress in another capacity less ‘exposed’, so you should not miss this unique opportunity to encourage the leaders of the world to pay a careful attention to the ‘*time factor*’ and to show respect toward the new generation.

Germany’s effort to tackle the global warming problem.

I know that several countries or groups of countries (Europe, Japan,) have ‘encouraged’ the US to act **urgently** on the environment issue and to match their levels of GHG emission reduction offers, so my 6-23-10 letter’s comments on this issue are/were not out of line. In my 6-23-10 letter I mentioned that the EU had offered in Copenhagen a 30% reduction from its 1990 GHG emissions level by 2020, but this offer was conditional on reaching an agreement including everyone, their unconditional offer was 20% only, I believe [experts have argued that a global GHG emissions reduction of 26% to 40% from the 1990 level by 2020 was necessary to prevent significant negative consequences, I believe]. On the other hand, it seems that Germany had offered a **40% reduction** from its 1990 GHG emission level by 2020, and that their offer was unconditional [I still have some research to do to confirm certain of my readings, but 2 sources including the German environment ministry seem to confirm it (my German is rusty too)!].]

-

If it is true, Germany is now working on this 40% reduction engagement (pledge), while Europe is working on a 20% reduction and the US **on a 4%** reduction only! Germany like the US has heavy industries, it builds cars, trucks, airplanes, trains, boats, and submarines, and it has big conglomerates in the chemistry-related-fields that are usually heavy polluters, and Germany is very concerned by not losing jobs as the US is, so their offer is more than significant. As you know, Germany is the number one economy in Europe (and in the top 5 in the world) and I believe the most populated country in Europe, so it is in many ways the European 'leader'. Some of you may think that this is how a leader should behave, that if you are the strongest, richest and brightest, you take on the greatest part of the work and indirectly encourage all those who are not as strong, as bright or as rich, to surpass themselves and do better than they would do under normal circumstances.

Also if for any reasons, one country does not meet its objectives, the community as a whole still reaches its engagements because of the leader's effort. Germany 40% engagement demonstrates a strong sense of responsibility and leadership, integrity, and dignity, and it shows respect for other, courage and even a form of compassion for those who are not as 'lucky' or as rich. If the UN headquarters were in Berlin instead of New York, we could think that they are trying to demonstrate their appreciation for being the host of the UN, but obviously it is not yet in Berlin. This is the kind of leadership we would like to see from the US. The 4% reduction offer from the US is 10 times less important than Germany's engagement although again the US is the number one economy in the world and is (or was in 2005) the world's largest cumulative emitter of energy-related CO2 emissions by far! Mr. Obama, Mrs. Pelosi, MM. Reid, McConnell, and Boehner, it is urgent that you show the kind of leadership Germany is showing in Europe and engage the US at a level comparable to what Germany has offered and is now, it seems, trying to reach.

The US delay in making significant cut in its 'CO2' emissions indirectly manipulates the future prices of the clean technologies [solar, wind, nuclear, and other CO2 production free technologies] you (and other) are developing. And of course, your delay in taking action worsens rapidly the situation of the world and poor countries' chances to come out of poverty rapidly. The US people could understand the unfairness of the US position on this issue and the grave consequences for the world if they were properly explained the problems, instead of being threatened of loss of jobs, and they would support their politicians in their effort to vote laws in this area that are good for everyone. It is **not** the adoption of a strategy to tackle the global warming problem and/or the adoption of **significant** GHG emission reduction engagements that result in job losses, it is the dishonesty of corporate leaders like Madoff, and the 'stupidity' and incompetence of the ones who recently bankrupted GM, AIG, and other US world leaders in their fields, and of course the lack of 'vigilance' and of sense of responsibility of some politicians, judges and financial experts who let that happened.

Mr. Bloomberg's eventual contribution and my 2011 planning proposal.

Mr. Bloomberg did not respond to my letter dated 3-25-08 [[exh. 3](#)] in which I asked him to participate in the preparation of the platform and **indirectly** asked him to finance part of its implementation, but he **may** have realized that he could be useful to the US and to the World if he worked on the platform, and may have contacted you to offer

his service if an agreement could be reached among you. The fact that he was reelected New York's Mayor and that he pledged to give part of his fortune to 'charities' puts him in a position to help implementing the proposals if you decided to approve them. If we create a Internet IO, we have to build its headquarters somewhere, and New York, near the UN headquarters, would not necessarily be a bad choice, especially if the Mayor offers to (personally) participate in the financing. As the result of Mr. Bloomberg reelection, 'we' could use his mayoral help, his specific experience and his pledge to donate money to build the new Internet IO in New York. The timing is right also because we have to take into consideration the fact that to build such an international organization takes time, so we must start as soon as possible if we want to be able to use the Internet efficiently to tackle our other global problems.

Mr. Bloomberg, in 2002 I wrote to several newspapers and magazines (including Businessweek) to inform them that I had been granted the refugee status (on paper at least) and to describe the 'Inco' computer project proposal and the 65 age limit proposal for leaders. It is unusual to see a refugee from France and my 2 proposals were topical at the time also, so I had hoped that they talk about the case, but they did not obviously. In July 2010 I wrote again to several newspapers and to Bloomberg Businessweek (by email) to forward them my 6-23-10 letter, but again none responded or talked publicly about my proposals and difficulties although my case is unusual and the proposals I make **are topical to say the least**. Perhaps if you forwarded them a copy of my letters and gave your point of view on the proposals I presented you, they would finally address these important issues publicly for everyone benefits. Some journalists believe you are preparing a new presidential campaign, so may be Bloomberg Businessweek editors do not want to ruin your chances by talking about a 65 age limit for presidents and/or of a 70 age limit for justices and congress members.

As I mentioned above, only the book's first draft is written (about 500 pages), so to finish the manuscript I need about **four months of full time work and some resources** to make three or four corrections, to make sure everything that I want to write is written and well organized, and to have an English major correct my spelling and grammar. I could not present you the manuscript before May 2011 (at least), **but I could move to New York in April** to meet 'you' (UN member state representatives), Mr. Ban Ki-moon and the UN experts to discuss the proposals, your concerns and other subjects you may want to address, and to work with you (from April to July or later) on a work plan for each proposal and a rough cost estimate that could be the basis of your decision to approve (or not) the platform (I would have to meet with the people at ICANN also, I believe). In July, August and September I could meet Mr. Obama and the US Congress leaders to discuss the proposals and I could also visit other countries to meet the country officials who would want to have more precisions on my application and the work plan. This timing would still give you enough time to take a decision in the UNSG selection process at the end of September or in October as you did last time.

Finally, I would have to meet Mr. Bloomberg and perhaps some of his '*colleagues*' billionaires who made the same pledge to donate money to ask them for their financial support conditional on your agreement to implement the platform. It is reasonable to think that they will financially support the platform if the UNGA agrees to implement it [we have to 'take them to their words' (as we say in France)]. The resources I need to finish the manuscript are office equipments [a computer, a printer, equipments to organize my

research,]; I also need the money to live during the next critical months and to arrange the meetings with you and eventually with your colleagues. There are two ways I could get the money, I believe: one, the US administrations (LA County, DHS,) or the French administration admit their errors and give me a significant compensation; and two, a publisher buys the book I am presenting you with an advance [it is not unreasonable to hope for an advance if you encourage in writing the publication of the book]. Your response to this letter is therefore critical because your support for the writing of the book would help convince a publisher to buy the book, and your decision to formally consider my application for the UNSG post would guarantee the sale of the book to a publisher I believe, and you may agree. [If you have another idea for the financing, please let me know].

The lawsuits still pending in court and the settlement prospects.

I still have 3 legal cases pending in the US, so I must briefly summarize their status. The US administration, DHS, is still trying to have me deported **on a full of lies deportation order** stating that I never applied for asylum and never had any permission to remain here although I obviously did apply for asylum and I was given several refugee documents! For the past three years I have filed pleadings after pleadings, but, although justice is supposed to be about telling the truth and finding the truth, no one, not a USDOJ lawyer, a DHS lawyer, a federal judge or an immigration judge saw anything wrong with so many obvious lies in a deportation order to harass, hurt and try to deport a poor individual like me (in the related case still pending against the SSA, the judges and AUSA refused to admit that I had 3 valid refugee documents in 2005 according to the SSA regulation, the appeal court is now reviewing the issue)! Recently, the immigration judge misstated and overlooked some critical facts I presented in my pleadings to deny my motion to reopen the asylum proceeding (and to evaluate my refugee documents), so I filed an appeal and a motion to stay the full-of lies deportation order again, and in response the LA ICE office scheduled a meeting **on 1-14-11** to discuss the status of my case.

I do not know the real objectives of this meeting, it could be to inform me that the ICE office has finally accepted to cancel its full of lies deportation order and to grant me the permanent resident status based on the refugee documents I was given by the DHS over several years, **or it could be to put me on detention or even to deport me** despite the obvious injustice that would result [a deportation (or a detention) would cover up the civil servants' criminal and civil wrongdoings on my case, prevent me from obtaining justice in the related negligence case against the LA County (**\$2.8 million** damage requested) and make it difficult for me to finish the book and to defend my proposals in front of the UNGA]. In the lawsuit against the LA County for negligence **that has been pending for 4 years** at the Superior Court, the judge who has rendered several decisions on the case, has never rendered a decision that took into consideration any of the arguments or legal authorities I presented! I went four times in front of the California Supreme Court and three times in front of the US Supreme Court to have the issues of the case addressed properly, but the higher courts always rendered summary decisions, so in 4 years not one issue has been honestly addressed and the entire 4 years proceeding (including my effort and pain) was completely wasted!

My complaint was not frivolous and the county put itself **twice in a default position!** On 8-16-10 the judge issued again a decision that ignored the arguments and legal authorities I presented and misstated a critical fact to sustain the LA County demurrer. Among the 2 issues he used to dismiss the case, one had already been ruled in

my favor in the previous case against the State of California (the county even agreed to that in its opposition), but, **on 1-10-11**, he still repeated his dishonest statement without any justification and without addressing the legal authorities I presented to deny the 2 motions I filed to ask him to reconsider his 8-16-10 decision and the earlier unjust refusal to enter default. I am forced to file an appeal after such an obvious dishonesty while knowing that another treachery surely awaits me and that I have to brief 7 or 8 issues because none was ruled on properly! The US judges – **at least** the many state, federal, and immigration judges [and the presiding and chief ALJ] who intervened on my case [more than 50 over 8 years including the highest judges in Californian and the US] - are **thieves and criminals** (I will give you proofs of this statement in the book).

They are thieves and criminals because the law allows them to be, because the administrations cover them up and more often than not ask them to be, and because the politicians close their eyes and derive their power from these judges' (and the administrations) dishonesty. In my 6-23-10 letter I gave you some details about the injustices I was victim of and described you some incoherence in the US Constitution and US laws that allowed such injustice to happen, and I am asking the US to admit and address these incoherence and weaknesses of their justice system and institution in front of the UNGA, but, of course, even though some countries are doing a little bit better than the US (I mentioned the ratio of opinions per inhabitant of the ECHR in my letter in comparison to the US Supreme Court), to address in front of the international community these intellectual issues will help everyone because every country will have, at some point, (or has to) to find the best way to organize its justice to have a justice independent and fair for everyone including the poor (who cannot pay for justice most of the time), and every country needs to improve the quality of justice decisions.

Conclusion.

Any country can present a candidate for the UNSG job, and I truly believe that the platform is in every country's interest. Poor and emerging countries should find many reasons to support the proposals which, among other, encourage rich countries to fulfill their engagements in term of ODA and to assume their responsibilities in the global warming problem. And they have an interest in formalizing their effort to take their people out of poverty rapidly with a green strategy and in addressing the income inequality and Internet governance problems also. Countries that often criticize the US policies like Iran, North Korea, Myanmar, Venezuela, etc. also should see in my application and platform an opportunity to encourage the US to review the efficiency of its institutions, to improve its justice system and to look at their concerns and positions from a different angle.

Finally, 'European' countries and Japan should also find many reasons to support the platform **(1)** that encourages the US to match their offers to reduce the GHG emission by 2020, **(2)** that resolves the Internet governance problems, and **(3)** that addresses the income inequality problem that the UN experts have identified as a cause of the recent financial crisis and that is a grave fairness problem of our society. So any country could formally propose my name to the UN Security Council, and it does not matter which country presents my name (but one still has to present it to have the issues formally addressed). Where the UNSG candidate comes from and which country submits his name are not as important when the candidate presents a platform of proposals to resolve

our global problems long enough ahead of time to let everyone think about it, and agree on its realization, the focus is more on the issues even if, of course, who defends the solutions is also important.

You have had a chance to think about my proposals for quite sometimes now, you know the issues that I address well, the UN experts appointed by Mr. Ban Ki-moon to look at the environment and development problems together have already worked for a year about (if they were appointed in early 2010), and of course I have worked on the various proposals for a long time also, so the timing I presented you above is reasonable and we can come up with a work plan and rough cost estimate for each proposal early enough for you to take a decision in September or October. And I hope you will use the occasion of my application to agree on a long term strategy to make the world a better place for everyone or at least to formally address the proposals in the context of the UNSG selection process.

I have already given you some details about the injustice I was victim of in the US and will give you more in the book to support the proposal to improve the justice system in rich countries. In my last letter [[exh. 2](#)], I described you some US justice systemic problems, incoherence in the US Constitution and other institutional problems (like the filibuster rule in the senate), and, of course, I am asking the US to admit these problems and to work on the improvement of its justice system and institutions in front of the UNGA so that everyone (every country) can benefit from the resolution of several complicated issues (improvement of the independence of justice, of the legal aid system, of the quality of decisions,), and I hope that the US and 'you' all will approve this proposal as well as the others and encourage the publication of the book I presented you.

I would be grateful to Mr. Deiss if he could forward this letter and book proposal to all the permanent representatives of member states because I will not be able to email it or mail it to everyone. I wish you a very happy new year, and of course I look forward to hearing from you and hopefully to working with you on the platform and remain

Yours sincerely,

Pierre Genevier

Ps: If you have difficulties accessing any of the documents linked to the book proposal or here, please let me know, I will forward you a pdf copy by email. And please, if possible, confirm me with a short email the sending of a letter address to me so that I can '*track it down*' [I will confirm the reception of your letter (s) by email or phone if any comes].

Exhibits: Exh.1: Book proposal [15 pages].

Exh.2: Letter to the UNGA dated 6-23-2010; [<http://pgenevier.luporz.com/npdf/letunga6-23-10.pdf>].

Exh.3: Letter to Mr. Bloomberg dated 3-25-08; [<http://pgenevier.luporz.com/npdf/letblo3-25-08.pdf>].