

5G CRISIS

AWARENESS & ACCOUNTABILITY



Regional Governments Standing Against 5G

Guest: Raphael Mahaim

The contents of this presentation are for informational purposes only and are not intended to be a substitute for professional medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment. This presentation does not provide medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment. Always seek the advice of your physician or other qualified health provider with any questions you may have regarding a medical condition.

Josh: So we're with Raphael Mahaim today. He's the Member of Parliament in Vaud, Switzerland, who is most responsible for leading the charge to get the official moratorium against 5G in his Canton or his region there in Switzerland. And Raphael, welcome to The 5G Summit.

Raphael: Thank you very much.

Josh: So you've gotten involved in a discussion and the debate that led to the moratorium, and before we ask the events that that led to that, I want to first of all ask; what are your reasons and concern for getting involved in this discussion and around 5G personally?

Raphael: So as a member of the Green Party, I would probably say two things, two main elements led me to get passionate about 5G. First thing is the possible consequences on Health and Environment; radiation is the main concern. We are now having time to seek documentation; scientific evidence about a possible risk. I'm not talking about fear, about undocumented risk. I'm talking about very serious people saying that there could be risks. Personally, I'm not an engineer. I'm not a scientist. I just try to look around and see what people say about that. So that would be the first concern. And the second concern, which I also believe is very important, is related to the energy consumption and direction Telcos are taking in selling, you know, connected phones. But not only connected phones because connected phones

is, let's say obvious now, but connected watches, connected refrigerators, connected cars, connected trampolines.

That's what I saw a few days ago. And I'm really concerned about those connected objects which may, generally speaking, also lead to massive energy consumption, which is in my perspective, given the climate change. And the challenges we have to face in this regard, which can be concerning and can be questioned. I mean, I'm questioning this. Do we need those connected objects? If yes, for which purposes? For whom? Yes, I believe some companies do need high speed internet. I do believe some researchers, some technical schools do need very high speed internet. But I'm really wondering whether everybody needs a connected car, the connected refrigerator. And frankly speaking from what I know of the topic that I would rather say no at that time we have other priorities, other needs, other social questions to address. And then that's probably the two main reasons to health risks and possible risk for the environment.

And on the other hand, this question about our name, it's really a matter of society. Where do we go, what do we want? What are our needs? And of course, how can we address climate change and such challenges.

Josh: Yeah, good. Thank you. Well, you're a PhD in Environmental Law from University of Freiburg. You have a law degree from University of Lausanne. And you're partner in a law firm in Lausanne, RM and Associates. So you come from a very strong background in terms of law legislation, how we can affect positive change, and how we can have real solutions rather than false solutions or maybe solutions that distract society or bring us down a non productive path. Tell us, with what's going on in there with the moratorium in Vaud and Geneva. And I think there are at least four Cantons that have had other past moratoriums or something. How big of a conversation is it is 5G at this time in Switzerland? And if you could maybe bring us up to speed what led to the moratorium that you spearheaded in Vaud?

Raphael: Avery good question. So let me first start with some explanations as a lawyer, because as a lawyer, and I'm mostly active in environmental law, building law, planning law. And what I saw those past months is a massive number of applications for building permits for antenna for 5G specifically. And this has been done without any certification, without any coordination. And as a lawyer, we are used to very complex procedures for building permits. I mean, if you want to build a little house in your garden to store your bike or whatever. You need to go through very complex procedure and it takes time. It has to be certified, coordinated with other possible permits that would be requested in the same area etc. And for those antennas that the mobile

network operators want to build in our region, it has been done without this coordination, without these certifications.

So in the last month, there have been literally hundreds of those applications for building permits not all coming from the same operators. So they are really in a very harsh competition and they are not coordinated in a way that for example, they say, "Okay, I will put up an antenna in this village, you will put up an antenna in the other village." So they're just applying for building permits. And for example, in a small village with no special needs for high speed internet, as there could be up to I don't know 3,4, 5 possible antennas, there would be permits that are requested from the operators. So that's has probably been the first element that led to a strong reaction typically in those in those small villages where people are just saying, "I'm not sure I want an antenna on the church of my village. I'm not sure I want an antenna on the school or just besides the school where my kids go to school."

So this was probably started end of last year, beginning of 2019. And then interestingly came a massive advertising campaign from the operators. Important to note that Roger Federer, our national hero, you know, tennis has been one of the guys being involved in those advertising campaign. So we could see Roger Federer's picture above him in every street in our cities saying 5G is coming, it's fantastic, you will have more and more internet, more speed etc. And this is exactly the time where people started to dispute this evolution to contest to say, "I'm not sure we need this, I'm not sure we needed it that way. I'm not sure it has to be so fast, it has to be so uncoordinated." And that started to be very concrete in our French speaking part of Switzerland. It started with a petition.

So a simple citizen started to gather signatures from people who were worried about 5G, and it was a very big success. Unexpectedly, I think in several weeks we got really several, even hundreds of thousands of signatures, which is very rare for such a small country as Switzerland. So that was probably in March and April and that led by us. I mean, some politicians and parliamentarians to wonder whether we should really try to react on the political level. And that's what we did indeed. And we were the first to react to the Green Party of my hometown, for several reasons because it is a big canton. So there were many of those applications where many antennas were being discussed around cantons. So it was really a big discussion coming on newspaper, etc. So we thought it was a good time to really ask some questions about this technology, about the way it was being brought in, about the way it was uncoordinated and uncertified. So that's what we did. We thought it was important to really act at that level.

And maybe one last comment on those last months; interestingly at the national level, official authority, the Swiss Federal Office for the environment ordered a study on possible risks for health and the environment. And that was at the end of 2018. And despite this, despite the fact that they are still waiting for the results of this study, some first building permits were delivered for antennas. And we thought that was really ridiculous because on one hand, you say, "Okay, we need to study the risk, we need to think about what we are doing, and you know the precautionary principle, which is a very important principle in Swiss law."

So we need to be careful. Precautionary principle on one hand, on the other hand, we are delivering hundreds of permits for those antennas all over the country. So we also felt there was a problem here with one authority saying, "We have to be careful. We have to do things with scientific evidence, to coordinate everything." And on the other hand building permits being delivered in uncoordinated and uncertified way.

So that was the start and then we came with this -- It's called the resolution in our Parliament, with this resolution asking for a moratorium. And that was the whole debates until when should this moratorium apply? What are we asking for? And we agreed with other parties because, of course, not all of the parties were exactly aligned with that debate we were trying to have. So we agreed with the major parties that we needed the moratorium at least until this first federal study give some results. And that will be probably at the end of the summer, this fall. So this moratorium that was eventually adopted by the canton and parliament, asked to freeze all those building permits until the study gives some scientific evidence, scientific results about possible health risks, for example, caused by 5G. So that's where we are now. And that's the whole story behind the 5G moratorium now in our canton.

Josh: Very good. Is it a similar moratorium that was also passed in the canton of Geneva and the other two? I'm sorry, the name escapes me right now.

Raphael: Yeah. Of course, don't worry. I mean, it's a very similar. We could enter into some legal details, but it's basically the same idea. Building permits should not be delivered for the coming weeks and months until there is more scientific evidence coming from this study ordered by the Federal Swiss Office for the environment. So it's very similar. I believe it's not the exact same formulation wording in the Geneva. Basically it's saying the same thing.

Josh: Okay. So moratoriums are saying no building permits, no permits for installing small cells for 5G related infrastructures, correct?

Raphael: Yes. And maybe if I may add one comment on this; those moratoriums came most cases in those cantons you mentioned before, came

from Parliament. And of course Parliaments are here to pass bills, law and not necessarily to deliver permit or freeze the delivery of building permit. So in most cases but what happened right after the Parliament passed those moratorium, what happened is that the members of the government said, "Okay, we agreed to freeze those building permits, because of the votes in the parliament and also interestingly, because we are lacking some of the methodology to measure radiation and to have scientific confirmation that one antenna does not harm or is not a health issue, for example."

The methodology to measure, to calculate those radiations, we actually don't have it for the new dynamic 5G antenna. So we are waiting for this methodology, for those instruments coming from the national authorities. And until we do have those instruments, this methodology, we will not deliver building permit anymore. So that was one more argument that was used by the government after the votes in the parliament to freeze the building permits for antennas in those five or six cantons where there has been more challenge.

Josh: Okay, good. So in April of this year, Vaud became the first Canton to pass that moratorium. And then about a week later we saw, I believe it was the Swiss times, a couple of major publications that industry is preceding anyway. They just flipped to switch on 5G, they just went live anyways and they intend to blanket I believe it was 90% of the country by the end of 2019 with 5G infrastructure, even though the moratoriums were passed. Can you tell us like how is it that that happened? I mean, is this an attack on the rule of law? Or what what's happening here? What's the best way? Because I actually had somebody write -- I wrote about this on our website; on Take Back Your Power. And a commenter sent me an email saying, "No, no, you don't understand how the government systems work and the different levels of government and all this stuff." So please, let me and the viewer know what the deal is there.

Raphael: So first thing to say those moratoriums has been passed, voted in, let's say five or six cantons, and we have in our country about more than 20 cantons. So theoretically and legally speaking, in the remaining cantons there has been no discussion, no moratorium. I mean, the operators, the Telcos are good to go. There is nothing that stands in their way in terms of obtaining building permits for antenna, that's the first thing. The second thing is that unfortunately, many permits had been delivered before those votes. In the first month of this year, there have been those hundreds of applications for building permits for new antennas. And some of them were delivered before the moratoriums were voted because we -- Shame on us. We did not react quickly enough, but I mean, that's the way it is. And some of those permits were delivered before the political discussion.

And third thing to say; the limit for radiation coming from those antennas are regulated at the national level. So it is true to say that seeing what is forbidden and what is not authorized, from a legal perspective, this is the power of the national level, of the national authorities. So by voting those moratoriums, we have not changed those federal provisions about limits for radiation, about what is authorized, what types of antennas are authorized, etc. The only thing we have done is to say we are freezing the building permit process because this is the power of the canton. The cantons, or even the communes are delivering the permits.

So it is a complex situation. But we could summarize it by saying; we did not change the law related to 5G antenna. The only thing we did -- and of course, it's already something. The only thing we did was to say please be careful, please think about what we're doing. So at the canton level stop delivering building permits for antennas at least until we know more about the technology, about potential risks and about the issues I mentioned before. So that's the situation if it is clear enough for the viewers, and that's a good thing.

Josh: That helps. So just one more question on that; when that moratorium was passed, did your canton actually stop granting more permissions to Telcos?

Raphael: Yes, because one of the members of the government also came to the parliament and address this issue during the debate discussion in the parliament. And confirm that her services, her people in the lower administration in the coming weeks and months, will not deliver those permissions and building permits for the Telcos. So it has caused those effects in our canton. But of course, it is in a way temporary. We are waiting to see what comes next, and especially when the study that was ordered at the national level will give some results. The moratorium might be cancelled or changed or modified or we will have a new discussion definitely in probably two or three months from now.

Josh: Yeah. Okay, good. So over in here in the United States, of course, the industry admits they've never done any safety studies. There are no studies to prove that 5G is safe and they don't plan on doing any studies. They are on zero budgets for that. Meanwhile, the independent science like you said, there are huge things to worry about it, especially in the millimeter wave spectrum. I mean, at 60 gigahertz, there's a study that says that's the oxygen uptake. There's a specific frequency range that has to do with the human sweat ducts and the operation there, which is more significant than you might think and of the functionality of our bodies. And there are tests that indicate how the

bacteria can morph into a different type of bacteria, potentially changing the human microbiome even.

Meanwhile, that's the independent science, but industry is not doing their own science. Here it's hugely corrupt, Raphael. It's just amazing. And I know in Europe with ignorance, it's very questionable there that the independent science is being honored. But I wanted to ask you; how confident are you in the federal report from Switzerland being unbiased and being considering the actual health effects on the people?

Raphael: That's an excellent. And to be very honest, I'm not very confident. So I will also want to see of course, what the first results are, but whether those results are scientifically solid, or whether we need more. And if we do have to ask for more independent scientific research, we will do that. Actually, we've been doing that for several years now. The Green Party among others has been asking for more independent research on that. Actually, it's interesting to know -- I know a few professors at the EPFL, which is our technical university in Lausanne, it's quite famous actually. I know several professors working there who really tell me, you know, we know there are some issues, we know there are some problems and some of our colleagues have made research on that and those results are in a way not used as they should be.

They're not using the scientific literature and also by federal officers, federal authorities as they should be. So we keep going, we keep on the fight and we will continue to ask for independent results. And yes, your question is very relevant. I'm not certain that study ordered by the Federal Office will give convincing evidence in a way or another. But of course, if it does indicate that there are some risks and that we have to be very careful, we will also use that in the sense of the precautionary principle to say, okay, then let's put very strict limits. Again, I'm not an engineer, I'm not a specialist, but what I do know is that we will need some very strict regulation to prevent those risks from materializing.

Josh: Yeah. And then with regards to the safety studies you mentioned, I mean, over here in North America and many other countries that they don't look at the non thermal effects. The science has outdated the official government agency safety limits. So here it's like 600 to 1000 micro watts per centimeter squared. And [ichner] I think is quite similar. But doesn't Switzerland have a much lower, much safer threshold for microwave radiation limits?

Raphael: That's a very good question. And to be very honest, I'm not sure I could give you the accurate answers just like this, but that's what they keep saying. And apparently from what I understood, it is true to say that

thresholds are particularly low for some length of ways, but for others it's not the case. So apparently we are being better than the European Union, for example, for some parts of the spectrum, for other situations and other risks, we are not as good as the national parties say. So that's something I'll have to study very thoroughly in the coming weeks and months because -- but well, of course, I don't have any influence on that because it's all regulated at the national level. So that's also why it's a discussion I did not participate in so far. But we will have to address those questions and we will have to discuss the threshold to see whether there are really as cautious as the National Party is saying they are.

Josh: Yeah. Good. Everyone watching, I just want to thank Raphael for coming on. It's about 10 o'clock at night at his time, he's burning the candle at both ends. So thank you, Raphael. A friend of mine in Europe sent me -- it looked like a picture of newspaper stand in Geneva. And it looked like the front page of the Geneva paper was all about 5G, the fact that they're installing anyway. And you just explained how they can find the loophole to do that. I asked this earlier, but I just want to quickly get your dive in. How big of a conversation piece, how big of an awareness piece is it there? How many people are aware -- Even percentages of the population?

Raphael: Yeah. It is and it as a very big surprise to me. It is a very important conversation. I would say at the time now we are speaking, it's probably as big conversation as time of change would be in our country. There has been a poll published I think a two or three weeks ago, which confirmed that more than 50% of the population is concerned about 5G, is worried about 5G, about possible risks for health.

And again, there is not one day without the newspaper article about 5G, about the new antennas, about scientific evidence coming from abroad or from our universities in Switzerland. So I would say it has, over the past month, a very important conversation in our country. And it will be a very big political discussion in the coming weeks and month. And again, it is a bit of a surprise because end of last year, there was the first advertising campaign that was coming over the country, some first reactions in some parties in some organizations. But it was very, very restricted, limited to some interesting people. And then it kind of spread almost to the whole population, I would say. So yes, very big conversation and a major concern in our country, especially the French speaking part of Switzerland.

That's maybe a one funny comment to make as you might know, as the viewers might know, we do speak four official languages in Switzerland. The most important being German first and then French second, then Italian comes third. And sometimes political discussions or discussions in the

population are very localized in one part of the country and are not equally important in all parts of Switzerland.

So this discussion about 5G has been very important in the past week and months, especially in the French speaking part of Switzerland. And some cantons in the German speaking parts of Switzerland kind of looked at us saying what are those people talking about? We're just not aware of what's happening. So it's now coming slowly, also the German speaking part of Switzerland it came later for some reason I cannot really explain.

Josh: Interesting. It just goes to show -- I mean, whatever area of influence in communication you have, you need to speak up, you need to share the information. You know, walls eventually will come down, but we -- I would say that there's a great need to do so in a timely manner because of the money and the motivation involved on the industry side. So with Geneva, Geneva is home to considerable, I guess -- It's one of the power centers of the World Health Organization.

And then also within Geneva, within Rome, for example, within some other cities, there's certain neighborhoods that have really took a hard line against any kind of 5G tower or small cell deployment. Can you talk to that a little bit? Is this the case of those who have more power and have more wealth, and influence standing up for themselves first and then protecting their own first? You know, meanwhile, less affluent countries or regions or cities might not be protected. You know what I mean? Is this kind of like the start of a potential class war?

Raphael: Very interesting question too. Honestly, I don't know. What I felt very, very strongly here in Switzerland is that this debate was also made possible by our culture about the democracy. As you might know, we do have a very strong democracy in Switzerland. So we're voting about four times a year about many different topics. For example, last year, we voted about whether farmers who dehorn horn their cows should receive subsidies. You know, such very specific questions being discussed and then lead to popular votes in Switzerland. So there is this culture of political discussions of democracy, and I believe that what the operators have made wrong in this whole 5G story is that they really did not respect that very specific Swiss culture about addressing the issues you know, preparing things slowly, giving the time to the population to prepare, to react to possible changes, etc. So that's probably one explanation about the reactions.

Now to come back to your question; honestly, I don't know. What I've experienced here is that most of the reactions came from the small villages, from small community with people who really had the impression that

operators are not paying attention to their needs, to their fears, to their concerns, to their questions. They're just coming, requesting a building permit, applying for a building permit and then building their antenna, again, as I said before, on the church, newer school, etc. So these reactions coming from small villages, small communities have been very strong. And whether it came from powerful communities or regions or not, I don't know. That's not necessarily what I felt those past weeks. But open question, interesting.

Josh: Yeah. Good. What are your thoughts on smart meters? I know that in some countries they're like, for example, Austria. I understand there's a mandate to install on everyone. I don't know the situation in Switzerland. The big controversy in France called Linky there, and of course, the UK and probably most countries. What are your thoughts on smart meters in general and how based upon -- what you understand, do they connect with the 5G plans?

Raphael: So my opinion on that is that, there might be a need for smart meters for some very specific people or industries or companies. But whether it should be all around the country for everybody -- And again, I'm skeptical here. It's about the same argument I tried to put forward when it comes to objects connected to Smart Objects. First question, the question of the need. Because again, the industry has massive financial interests here and does not question the needs of the industry that just creates the needs or makes you think there is a need where there's no need. So this is the first question I would prefer. Do we need this? Do we need those connected objects? Do we need those smart meters? I've to come back to your question. And frankly, I would rather say no. At least not how they're selling it right now, and at least not in the very uncoordinated quick and disrespectful way they're trying to develop this. So that would be my theoretical answer at that time now and we will see what comes of course in the future. But let's be careful, that will be my idea and let's not be too hasty.

Josh: Yeah. How do you see these events in Switzerland? Also was it the Minister for environment in Brussels, her statement against 5G and saying we won't treat our people like guinea pigs there. And I think Russia as a country said that they're not going to transfer licenses from 4G to 5G frequencies. I've yet to get the details, but my understanding is Russia is taking right now a very hard stance against allowing just 5G or wherever. And in the States, even there's something like at least 20 cities, and probably much more by now that are passing laws and ordinances to basically limit the deployment of small cells, which are the basis of 5G; to limit the distance or has set a minimum distance away from residences or schools, for example, 1500 feet you know, 300-400 meters or something like that.

But people it seems like really are watching Switzerland, they're watching Brussels, they're watching these sort of these power centers. And these countries where they have a lot of international respect for not getting involved in wars and having precautionary principle and so forth. How do you see what's going on there affecting -- perhaps inspiring change also in other parts of Europe to start.

Raphael: I really like this idea of us having a role to play in this whole discussion not because we are better than the other countries, not because we have more independent researchers than the other countries because it might not be the case. But because we are among the richest countries and we are in a good position to question those deployments of the 5G technology. And if we do that, then it probably means that any country can do it as well. So if we can afford in a way to question this, given the fact that we have very powerful industries, very, very important universities -- If we can afford those political discussions, if we can take the time to think about what we're doing, then I believe we can also play a role in the whole discussion worldwide in a positive way.

Not to rush into technology we don't know yet, because of the risks, etc. Let's take the time to think, to limit, to regulate, to do things in an intelligent way. And I believe we also need that at every global level, we need to do things in a more intelligent way. I mean, climate change is another concern we might want to address in a very serious and clever way too. And this is not what we have been used to do in the past decade. I would say we're just going very fast into new technological developments because the industry tells us there is a need here, you need to need to develop this. I say no, and I'm very happy Switzerland can contribute to emphasize those important discussions. We need to have about our future, about our development, about our people, and about our environment

Josh: So the people that are watching this, whether they're in Switzerland or in Australia or United States or wherever, what can they do to -- because it seems like we have to join forces here. We have to actually get involved in support of our local governments or regional governments, and then put the pressure on federal governments to stop this, to realize we're all in this together. You know, there's no nobody who gets a free pass for not being zapped by this technology or not being affected by the wasted energy or the surveillance. How can we support those who are in positions of gate keeping or local regional power who want to do the right thing here? What can people do?

Raphael: I do believe nonprofit organizations will play a very important role in the decades to come. So there are many organizations, for example, in our

country who have been concerned about 5G, and we have an agile population and also the politicians about 5G. So join such an organization, give some time and work with those people who try to fight for their rights and to just defend the either the environment, or population health, etc. So that's the first thing you can do. I would also say as a politician here, as a Green politician, there is always a possibility to join a party which also addresses those issues and helps the decision takers to understand what is at stake here, because that's what we do as a Green Party.

Obviously, we don't have the power to do everything we would want to do for the future of our country. But in Parliaments, in local governments, in the cities, in the communes, we do have the power to have some impact on the political discussions which are being for example, which people have heard about 5G or about other environmental issues. So that's a second possibility. And of course, third possibility, which is very, very important in Switzerland. I mean local fights as petitions against 5G project. For example, here in Switzerland we can oppose to a building permits which is being delivered and then, for example, ask the court to say whether the building permit is in accordance with the federal and cantonal law. So there are many ways you can also try to slow down the deployment of 5G technology at the very local level. So that would be hard way to help and to join the forces.

Josh: You know, there's a website here in the States called *telecompowergrab.org*. And then there's another one; environmental health trust. And there's several websites that are talking about -- they're giving support and resource to local governments to pass these ordinances that I mentioned. You know, part of it is you can't know small cells within a certain distance of people basically. And the second is, local governments charging what they're calling recertification fees. So using their local authority to require the industry reps, the operators to come out in person and re-certify every year that this technology is safe and it's functioning properly within the legal standards and charging, you know, they can charge whatever they want. They're using their authority to say you know, this is harm to us and we're going to charge.

So based upon that, they're seeing sometimes some operators will just withdraw their applications completely because it's not profitable in that case. So it's another unique strategy. I don't know if they're doing the same thing in there.

Raphael: Yeah, I fully agree. And I gave earlier the example of those operators applying for building permits in the same village. Three or four operators wanting a permit for a new 5G antenna in the same, let's say 500 people village. It's an absolute nonsense. And having people fighting against that will

probably reduce the number of antennas at least from 4 to 1, or maybe possibly to zero. So yes, we do have those leverages which helped slowing down the deployment of this antenna

Josh: So you mentioned earlier, Raphael, that with the awareness right now in Switzerland, and it will be increasing in other countries and regions. It's like on a par with the conversations about major environmental issues. I just want to switch gears kind of in this conversation to talk more -- I guess, bigger picture, or what does it relate to. You know, it seems like humanity is in kind of a crisis right now. And we're seeing different aspects of it from different issues and matters and problems in our world. We're seeing it on the personal level, we're seeing how people treat each other even. It's like, we're feeling this compression.

From your perspective, is there a conscious awakening happening in humanity, like we're seeing the yellow vest movement in France and Belgium and other places, it's expanding rapidly. But we don't even hear about it here. It's not even on the news. Facebook is basically censored. But from your perspective, Raphael, is there a positive thing that's happening, like a conscious awakening that maybe you know, this crisis is just part of that process?

Raphael: Yes. I strongly believe there is something that's happening now, and I think it's very positive. It's probably because people are starting to see that we have to act collectively for our future. And we have to stop thinking about only ourselves, and about our industry and about our very short term profits. So I do believe there is awareness about long term concerns, long term issues. Time it is of course the most important of those issues. You know, very interesting two weeks ago, you've probably seen that on TV there has been this big fire on Norte Dame in Paris. I don't know if you followed what happened the days after that big fire, because that was the most interesting thing from my perspective. Of course, the night it happens, everybody was sad saying, you know, it's very important monuments in Paris which has been going down, etc, etc. The day after that happened, some very rich people in France promised they would offer millions of Euros to rebuild the Norte Dame, which I mean, why not?

But interestingly, let's say in the days after that -- now, people are starting to say, "But hey, if we can get so much money in a few hours to save a church or to rebuild the church. Why can't we have those millions of Euros for even more important purposes, typically, environmental crisis, climate change." And I believe that is also showing that people are starting to understand that we are facing major issues, major challenges, and we have to join our forces, as you said before, and we have to make our governments understand that

there is more at stake here than on the church. Although, of course, I do believe that was important to rebuild Norte Dame. But the point is, it shows what's beyond those very local and legitimate concerns about a fire, for example. There are more and bigger concerns. And yes, this awareness is coming. Yes, 5G is part of it.

And maybe one last comment on that. I believe people are starting more and more to question technology. Technology is in a way fantastic. I mean, it allows us to speak now as we do. We are 10,000 miles away from each other, we are speaking, we're having a very interesting conversation. This is technology. This is fantastic. But on the other hand, technology also means the Fukushima disaster in Japan. And also means 5G and its effects on health. It also means waste of energy and oil being spilt all over the world for stupid reasons. So people I believe are questioning technology, because they see that technology will not bring happiness. And we need more for our future than simply industries selling technologies and selling new things, new needs, with new happiness that should be simply coming from technology. So yes, this is a very important movement we are seeing. I believe and I hope it will bring some hope for future and for the common future of mankind basically.

Josh: Yeah, thank you. Well said. I agree we absolutely need to draw a line in the sand, take a committed resolved approach that new technologies have to be vetted and proven safe before they can ever be released upon the people and even into the marketplace. The precautionary principle is very crucial to uphold. You know, that's like a doctor's first oath. First, do no harm. The doctor has that responsibility, because their job is to help people and preserve their health. It should also be applied to industry and the executives there who stand to profit because what they are doing is demonstrating harm to health. So we need to -- I think as people really just get woken up, which you are helping to do with getting committed, and you're taking a very important role in leadership in Switzerland. So thank you, Raphael.

And I also want to just encourage the viewer and also Raphael relating to how people can connect with their governments. That's something that our group feels very passionate about. So we have made it available for people to quickly and effectively send an email, a tweet, a phone call to their elected officials. So the people if you're watching this, go to our website, you'll see exactly how it's set up for you to do so efficiently. Because like Raphael, there are elected officials everywhere who want to be part of the solution that they need to know.

At some point, Raphael, you came into knowledge about the harm of this technology and about the actual science. And it was probably someone else that cared enough to share with you. Yeah, go ahead.

Raphael: Let me add something on that because I really agree fully with all of this. And if I may add something as an elected official, I do not have enough time to have documentation about all the environmental issues I want to address, I want to work on in the parliament I'm working in. So I need that information from people because I cannot myself obtain that information on my own. So that's another way to say what you said a minute ago. We need help. We need help from the people, from specialists, from scientists, from organizations, from you guys.

And we need information as elected officials. Because if we want to be part of the solution, we need information, we need evidence, we need the scientific results. And all of this cannot come from us alone. It has to come from you, from the people as well.

Josh: Absolutely. Well said. So yeah, if you're watching this, go to our website, do that action. Send that email, reach out to your elected officials. It just takes a few seconds. And then we're going to be part of this together. We're organizing the tribe of those who really care about this world and each other coming together. So do that now. Anyways, Raphael, thank you again for your time and your energy and your commitment, and for talking with us today.

Raphael: Well, thank you for the invitation and for that great conversation. Thank you, Josh.

Josh: Thank you.