

Pierre Genevier
Foyer Le Lagnon
30, Chemin des Blanchards
CH-1233 Bernex
Suisse

P.S. n° 2.5 1/20

To : Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland, WHO
Mrs. Mary Robinson, OHCHR
Mr. Juan Somavia, ILO
Mr. Mike Moore, WTO
Dr. Kamil Idris, WIPO
Mr. Yoshio Utsumi, ITU
Prof. G.O.P. Obasi, WMO
Mr. Ruud Lubbers, HCR
Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, UN Office at Geneva
Other I.O.s 'Managing Directors'
Country Leaders (countries member of the United Nations!)
Mr. Kaspar Villiger, Suisse
Pope Jean Paul II

Copy: Mr. Han Seung-soo, President of the General Assembly of the UN
Mr. Massimo D'Alema, Italian Parlement
Le Soir, Belgique
The Swiss Press

Geneva, December 23rd, 2001

Object: Justice, democracy and intellectual property.

Dear Mrs. and Mr. Government Chiefs, Directors-General, and Secretaries General,

Referring to my recent letters of November addressed to I.O. Chiefs and also to my previous ones, I take the liberty of writing you again to make few more remarks concerning the different subjects I 'discussed'. Since these remarks concern every country, I am also addressing this letter to every country leader in the world.

But first please let me give you briefly the results of my trial and asylum demand. The European Court refused to study further my request and to forward me the admissibility report. The decision is not motivated and the report on the admissibility is confidential! Every one of you has certainly heard a judge say 'do you swear to tell the truth, all the truth, nothing but the truth...', what would be the point to say that if the judges can lie. There can be no justice, if the judges are allowed to lie. If the European Court of Human Rights does not say anything when the French justice lies, then the justice of 40 countries have the right to lie.

The Swiss justice also refused to study my demand for asylum because I could not pay the necessary 600 CHF. They keep drug dealers in their Foyer as you can read in the attached article (att. 2) and they refuse to give me the time and 'protection' necessary to present my case to the international justice. Of course, this is not the best place to denounce corruption, many corrupted politicians from France (and other countries) come here to hide the money they steal, but the project proposal I presented is important for every country even the one non member of the UN. Switzerland behaves badly for a country that 'harbors' so many I.O.s.

Now, please let me come back to my remarks concerning the age retirement limit of 65 for Country Leaders and International Organizations Chiefs. This rule would concern only a tiny bit of the world population, since there are about 190 countries and 50 I.O.s. Between the persons in post and the potential candidates, it would not be more than 1000 persons all together out of about 6 billions people living on earth. And of course these persons could still continue to work in a lower position after this limit, and still help the world and their country.

I will summarize again the arguments I presented you in my different letters and also 'discuss' why this is a very important rule that would be a major management (good governance) contribution to the world as I wrote it last time. I first mentioned the importance of time in 'our' fight against poverty and the recent effort made by the International Community to tackle the poverty issue (debt relief initiative, Mr. Turner's donation, ...). From these remarks, I derived that the leaders should keep a lower profile after 65 to pay careful attention to the time factor and to show that they have a strong conscience.

I gave the example of some leaders who have already paid attention to this idea or at least mentioned it (like Mr. Eltsine who mentioned it in resignation speech, ...). I also described the bad example showed by Mr. Mitterrand who continued his job until 80 almost. Then I gave more scientific arguments like a study of researchers in work psychology that derived several steps in the professional life of a manager. Among these steps, the period from 62 to 67 was described to be the retirement transition phase, which allowed the manager to decrease progressively his professional activity to ease up and improve his 'retirement life'.

I also mentioned the fact that someone in his 60s or 70s may more easily fail to respect the younger generations because he will never be 40 or 50 again, whereas someone in his 40s or 50s will 'always' show respect to people in their 60s or 70s because he has a good chance of being 60 or 70 one day. I also talked about special responsibilities of leaders like the 'training' or 'preparation' of younger generations and the mid and long term planning. And said that if a leader does his job well he should have found and prepare at least few possible candidates to replace him by the time he is 65 years old (if not much earlier).

I recalled the fact that the lifetime expectancy at birth was only around 74 for the 'best' countries. And that a leader of 66 could not really have a 'clear view' of the long term evolution (15, 20 years) of our society when his life expectancy in 'good health' is only ten years or less, and therefore that he could not assume properly his long term planning responsibility. Apart from these arguments, I also mentioned the study of ILO concerning the retirement pension scheme