

## Transcript of Lech Walesa Interview of 29<sup>th</sup> April 2004

**(1) JP:** First question: At the age of 27 you were involved in one of your first political acts. During street riots an attempt was made to attack a militia building and liberate some people who were arrested by the authorities. You tried to find a peaceful solution, and nearly succeeded in releasing the detainee's without anyone being harmed. However, despite your good intentions, the crowd called you a traitor, because the militia used your efforts to buy time and attack people when their backup arrived.

**(1) LW:** I was fighting with the communist system since I was born. But I was fighting only because this system wasn't telling the truth. I was brought up with simple principles – white is white and black is black. And this system was telling one thing and was doing something else. I was in the opposition all the time. However significantly, my fight was seen, as you noticed, in 1970. Despite the fact that I stood out somehow, I didn't like brutality and forcing a fight. I liked chess, I liked to fight and win intellectually. And I let the force of ideas go against each other, they should fight, not a man. In this connection, when I saw that the workers were fighting from one side, with workers in uniforms on the other side – I thought to myself that this is absurd! And this is why I tried to say to them all – listen, what for all of this? Let's talk and find a solution. And my actions were always like that and stayed like that until today.

**(2) JP:** Is that to say that from the early days your fight was a non – violent one...

**(2) LW:** Yes. Without violence. Conquer evil with good, lack of democracy – with democracy. Some big problems you can conquer with force, but force of the intellect.

**(3) JP:** Do I understand right that from early childhood you were against communism.

**(3) LW:** Yes

**(4) JP:** And in your youth you decided to become more active in this fight...

**(4) LW:** As a matter of fact I sunk because of my character. With my way of living I was continually walking into mines and continually I had to remove them. Unintentionally I was becoming an oppositionist, the warrior, but only because it was life which made me to do it, not because I wanted to do it.

**(5) JP:** So you noticed this contradiction between reality and what the communist regime was saying.

**(5) LW:** Exactly. I noticed that first at school and later at work. Some frauds, lies, bad conditions. So it was often that people, I mean groups I was working with, would protest but only in private discussions. While I mobilized them or organized them and we were coming with this protest to our director, manager or someone and I noticed that it was very often that when we were near the door there was plenty of us. But when we came in with our complaints – I was left alone. But I had never moved back.

**(6) JP:** Then this behaviour made you a leader.

**(6) LW:** Yes, exactly this.

**(7) JP:** Which specific features of your character?

**(7) LW:** Exactly those ones – that I never retreat, that I always solve problems and I am not afraid. I'm only afraid of God and no one else. And right now – maybe a little bit of my wife.

CLIP 01 FINISH

CLIP 01/01 SOUND ONLY. NEED PICTURE OVERLAY for 11:08

**(8) JP:** Some politicians suggest that sometimes we should use a force. Do you agree with this or are you against it?

**(8) LW:** You know that there are exceptions. Imagine that you come back home and there is some madman with hatchet who cut off two people's hands and now he is threatening your mother or sister. Wouldn't you fight with him if there is any possibility? And even hit him with a fork in his eye or anywhere else. You know, those are specific cases. And those cases can involve us using force. But we can use force only in exceptional situations.

**(9) JP:** So if someone attacks we are allowed to use force...

**(9) LW:** No. No. No. No. We should never respond with force but like I said there are exceptions. Imagine that you are coming back home and someone is killing your family and you have a gun and what? You shoot him. But you are not a murderer because you rescue your sister, wife, because this madman already had cut someone's ear or nose and you can see that that there is a trail of blood. Those are cases when everyone should defend oneself and one shouldn't sell their lives cheaply and do something that is like asking, „kill me“.

CLIP 01/02 FINISH

Decide if Title or voice over is needed

**(10) JP:** Voice Over: Maybe now we will move to the questions about organization. How did you manage to bring your own ideas and ideas of the trade unions to the whole society?

**(10) LW:** It's not like that. My generation received from the previous generation the world which was divided and Poland which was forced by communism to accept an imposed system and organization. The previous generation told us that they didn't have the power, that they were betrayed and that the war got themselves into this situation. And we were instilled with the belief that we must regain what we've lost. In forties and fifties we were trying to cast the yoke with armed hands. In sixties and seventies – we were fighting not with arms but with demonstrations in the streets. And this was bloodily suppressed. And, as you noticed before, I got involved in this fight in seventies. And based on our trials and mistakes we came to eighties and we created a monopoly - „Solidarity“, and by building this monopoly we defeated the communistic monopoly. As a strategist (because I had the biggest experience from the group fighting on the coast) I was preparing another form of fight – it meant “Solidarity” though I did not name it like that. I was thinking about a union structure between Poland, Czechoslovakia and other nations of (middle) Eastern Europe. If “Solidarity” lost we would fight another superior form of organization. However, it is not worth mentioning because we managed to build “Solidarity” and our organization extorted on Brezhnev concessions for free unions, and this caused the trial of destroying us. Nevertheless, that did not happen, instead on Gorbachev we extorted capitulation.

**(11) JP:** We are interested in organizational issues. How the opposition organized themselves for the first time?

Zooming Issue's in CLIP 01/03

**(11) LW:** We won't write a book. I ask for a serious interview not a book. I can write it myself and I will get a lot of money.

(12) JP: ...what did the „Solidarity“ structure look like, was it hierarchical or dispersed regionally?

(12) LW: What is this, I'm asking? Because I see that it is not an interview but a book or maybe a film? What is this?

Jump cut.

(13) JP: We ask this because Iranians do not know how to organize themselves and you could prompt something. For example: If I was around in those days and I was working in a small bakery in Krakow and I wanted to know how I could join „Solidarity“. What would be my first steps, where I could find information... ?

(13) LW: Ahh.. Now I understand and I will try to help you.

CUT HERE

Madame, the question is if Poland is a suitable example? And so in seventies and eighties I was already an oppositionist. Until the Pope was chosen, for twenty years I organizationally acted and for those twenty years and I managed to recruit from 40 million people – 10 people. From 40 million only 10 people! – that was before the Pope. There were more groups like ours in Poland. There were free unions in Silesia like KOR or ROP, different organizations... But they were not big ones. There was no climate for organizing anything. First of all people were frightened, second – they didn't believe that there is a chance to overthrow communism, some people got involved in system, so there was no climate for organizing, for doing anything. Because of many reasons. I spoke that time with many leaders of the world – presidents, prime ministers, even kings and I was telling them that Poland will defeat communism. They were looking at me surprised – that's not possible! We were encouraged, even we were given some money, not too much, they helped us somehow. But no leader believed in the chances of this happening, no one believed that we will succeed. No chances. Maybe in the distant future, but for a very long time communism will be invincible. And in this state of affairs an incredible thing happens – a Pole become the Pope. In this climate, when no one knows how to end it, a Pole become the Pope and comes to Poland. There are millions of people on his meetings. All Europe, all the world, looks on – what is happening? A Communist country but they go down on their knees, they pray and sing! All the world was surprised. And the Holy Father says those famous words: „Don't be afraid, change the face of the earth“. And he leaves. **After his departure I didn't manage for one year, but I don't do anything – people woke up and became more courageous. There were some rudimental organization – a main one and some others.** We organized this into strikes, protests and fights, into agreements and in this way we subverted communism.

Is it possible in Iran? If it is possible – I don't know. Subversion or organization? Probably it is possible, but with a different mechanism. First of all we have to think if there is climate, if people want to organize themselves, if they have a common desire which could bring them together. In Poland at that time even communist were against communism. Only, they wanted changes, but they wanted to keep their power and privileges. Everything was quite alright for them just so long as they keep their authority. So, now it's necessary to discover what in Iran could unite people and caused a situation that people will want. Because if they want it, it will happen. Direct them, you have to find only a few good people who will know what direction to aim them and you can achieve everything.

CLIP 02 FINISH

(14) JP: [You have said in your biography that a] big danger is the hatred towards the authority, because hatred does not permit one to think objectively. How did you control this?

**(14) LW:** That's true. The worst are those emotions, hatred. And if the crowd has emotions and hatred, it will burn or destroy something. But it's worse if the leaders submit themselves to such emotion. I learnt to control it because, all my life, I was at the head of the small group, family, later unions, so I learnt that in those places one has to be completely without emotions. One ought to learn how to keep ones cool and know that one has to think continually. And of course – the leaders have to be totally devoted to the affair. Because if they have the smallest hesitations, if they think about money, girls, about anything else – it's the end, they won't lead the fight properly. Big fight because for something small maybe... But not a big one. OH Darn. I forgot the question.

**(15) JP:** How did you avoid the trap of nonobjective thinking...

**(15) LW:** Faith, probably it helped me that I was believer.

**(16) JP:** You WERE?

**(16) LW:** I was and I am the believer. Of course a failing believer, sinful, not a saint, not a prophet. But I treated faith seriously and this helped me to come out of hatred, and my faith didn't allow me to be afraid and let me to sacrifice myself totally. **I believe that people on the top positions can't achieve a lot if they don't have faith, and it doesn't matter from which religion.**  
**CLIP 02/01 FINISH**

Delete Film CLIP and use sound only??

**(17) JP:** **Our problem is that in Iran it is the church that imposes a regime that spreads cruelty. People don't know which idea they could turn to. What would be a solution to this situation?**

**(17) LW:** Of course I don't know too much about that area. It's difficult for me to decide what would be appropriate, I would have to observe for about one month... So you have to invite me because I'm a quick learner.

**CUT**

I predict that for the next 50 years religions will go back to their right place and will not create hatred. And if anyone sees on TV a religious leader who encourages killing, people will think – “so that's your little game! Go and die yourself and I'll wait”. Everything slowly will go back on the right track and religion in it's own places and what will happen? It will become evident that God is the same in all religions just there are too many teachers and probably they are not very good teachers, we just won't listen to them. But the contemporary situation will last for long time. There are still attempts of taking advantage, but those are the death pangs of not so serious religious leaders who treat a human being badly and often take advantage of peoples stupidity and simple mindedness. However, these are their death pangs because they would like to stop the world's development. They will not do anything, only that some people will die because of their stupidity.

**(18) JP:** What was your darkest, worst experiences in opposition years? I ask because Iranians suffer a lot.

**(18) LW:** Madame, again it's a bit of a different fight. And again not everything suits that. A man in the fight and basically in an activity, he crosses certain thresholds. Those thresholds are on different levels. First one – some interrogations, some difficulties, unpleasantnesses, later discharges from work. And later you cross such higher thresholds where they can kill you, where you are forced to betray your principles, so every person actively engaged and people who deal with those issues, as I say – they have to cross these barriers. One of the last barriers is the rough game about life. And now, the theory won't help to understand this or in one meeting. It's necessary to live in the fight, to participate, so you can cross those thresholds and in the end cross the barrier of dread. And now, again – one ought to gather people, who crossed some barriers. Because people are on different levels – one was able to throw a leaflet, another one only to pick

it up and read it. It is necessary to organize everything in relation to crossing those barriers. To bring some people for meetings, so they can read leaflet and meet the oppositionist. To take the others for demonstration because they are on a different, higher level. Because if the activists get to heavy weight on the first meeting – everyone get scared and no one will come. It's like with sportsmen, a weight-lifter. If you gave 500kg to the pre-school child you would crush him. One ought to prepare him slowly – first weight, slowly – second weight. Similar situation is in fight. Leaders have to take this into account – and in that case they will be successful.

**(19) JP:** What do you consider your biggest failure during the opposition years and how did you manage to overcome this?

**(19) LW:** I had never accepted defeat. But I accepted that I turned out to be weaker and that I had gone on a wild goose chase. And I was wondering – „so yes, I was right, and it was charge, it was too heavy weight“. One has to take step back, train oneself and go again. So, I never accepted that it's my opponents contribution that he won, but that it's my fault that I was badly prepared. I played badly. This is why I always thought about defeat as about stimulus to further the fight and thoughts – why and where one made mistake? Is there any chance or there is no chance? And my way of thinking meant that I didn't have any defeats and I didn't have great victories either. Well, every victory cause that – „, the further into forest, the more trees“. Every victory causes the next field to open and you have to go and win again. And thinking about defeats in this way – it was my fault that I was weaker, it wasn't the fault of my opponents that he was better and wiser. One has to think how to be better in the next round.

**(20) JP:** Like in sport.

**(20) LW:** Yes, I think so.

**(21) JP:** I would like to ask about the other side, about the authority – what kind of methods did they used to divide and destroy you?

**(21) LW:** In a serious fight, all tricks are allowed. Communism murdered over 200 million people. I'm not mistaken. Over 200 millions people! And this is why individuals don't count. In a fight – let's not joke, as I say – all tricks are allowed. Only that there are different thresholds of fighting and methods of fighting. One time the hunger strikes were fashionable. And in the beginning we fought with words: „, working class is against working class state (gouvernement)“. From the public point of view it was unbearable. Communists couldn't understand it. Because they had a monopoly, because they thought that they rule in the name of the working class and they have such a right. But they ,took' this right by themselves. And on the other hand – we couldn't say that we wanted to dissolve the Warsaw Pact and the USSR!. They would have to shot us! So we would say – „,we want bread! Organize your work. You, yourself, you are not able to give us bread. We are hungry!“ So they felt ashamed. And we said that we can work for bread together... And they let us to create a trade union. And we knew that if we tear out one link which goes towards the right direction, they will walk towards the left – they will have to destroy this link or this link will destroy the system. Those are the rules which you have to know, bring them to the light and at the same time you have to give your opponent no choice. Because he can't do anything unless he use the power of the atom (nuclear weapons). And we played in such a way that they had no possibility to attack us. We won with them sometimes even with populism and demagogy, but we forced them – either you will give us what we want, or you will let us to organize this by ourselves, or you will let us to rule – we will have free unions. And in this way we drove them to the wall, that they had to give more, even though they knew that it will end up for them in a bad way. And this is how it looks like and in the beginning you can't bring out important problems, beautiful ideas... Because one can't drive the beast to the wall because it will wave its paws and hurt you. One has to choose a good time, organize good arguments for the fight. And here there is probably lack of some elements and this causes all your adversities.

Cut Out, (otherwise would have to explain who's Mazowiecki)

(22) JP: Why did your colleague, Mazowiecki, insist on not taking revenge on the communist?

(22) LW: He told them – „Gentlemen, all of you who get involved in communism don't let those communist crafty fellows take advantage of you. We won't go back to the past. [Division line]. We will square up with the offenders, criminals, bandits, but everyone else who got involved in system – we will shut our eyes to it. Poland is free, we are successful, let's build the country and let's forget about past. Don't do cuckoo, because it has no sense“. And it was very wise at that time. Because the other move, well, it's not known what could have happen. It could have brought us to the wholesale slaughter. And Mazowiecki had seen how the Reds seethe themselves, how they prepare themselves to overthrow us. And he knew about it as good as I knew. And he was successful because all the base, even in this Party, most of them were Polish patriots. Only that they wanted the power, they wanted to travel to West, they wanted to get promoted, to be professors, but they didn't identify themselves with that system. And this is why you can't... But they could be used by those communist crafty fellows, at least for voting for communists. And this is why I don't agree with those extreme opinions and as a moderator I can say that it was right. Today one can have lots of hesitation, someone can say – well, we should have squared up with them, imprisoned them. Oh yes, we should, but why this person, who is saying that, didn't do that? Where was this person when we were fighting and there was only few of us? Now it's easy to criticize and talk such a nonsense. Today we can look at this in a different way, we can have some hesitations, but it was in the different time and in different conditions. It was necessary to do it and Mazowiecki had done a good job. We survived till today.

(23) JP: The most important is that some of the criminals were punished...

(23) LW: You know madame, if you want to punish criminals; you have to change the law. And who is suppose to do that? We took over the authority from the communists. And everything – law, constitution, everything was from that period. So how do you want to do it? How? And many prosecutors prosecuted many real patriots. And now what – the same people will judge offenders? After all, many law courts prosecuted unjustly the opposition. And now what? In one day will you change all the lawyers? In one day will you change relation of the law to the adjudication? You know madame, this is a process! Unless we make a revolution! Exactly! If it was on the way of revolution – everyone who performed any communist activity since childhood, straight away would be taken on the side for executed. And the others would be forbidden any activity. But we choose the evolutionary path. We have to prove everyone in the name of law, we have to convince everyone, even imprison someone but never do something because we „want to“.

CLIP 04 FINISH

(24) JP: I would like to ask about Shirin Ebadi...

(24) LW: About what?

(25) JP: Shirin Ebadi. This lady who recently received the Nobel Prize.

(25) LW: Oh yes, yes...

(26) JP: You commented that the Pope should receive this prize...

(26) LW: No. The issue is how the question was asked. I was asked in this way: „Pope was a candidate and he didn't receive this prize, is it just?“ They asked me in such a way. And I answered – well, no. From the human and just perspective Pope should get it without discussion. Well, they cut it and wrote that I was against her and that I was standing for someone else. But

this is not true. The issue is how they asked me that question. In my comments I said that the Nobel's jury treat this prize a little bit like a trade agreement, I mean – jury says thank you to the winner for his fight and attitude, but at the same time the jury treats this prize as an encouragement, as a further help for one's fight. And the Holy Father, doesn't matter if he get the Nobel Prize or not, because he worked, he works and he will work and no one has to encourage him. But everyone else needs this encouragement. And this lady who got this Nobel Prize for her attitude, for her life-history, but also as an encouragement to further the fight. Because the world thinks that it's worth to fight for human rights. But well... Comments were different...

**(27) JP: Do you think that that Nobel is given for political reasons?**

**(27) LW: Well, no, not exactly. Madame, there is the law in the world which is accepted by the community at large, but in many places those laws (rights) are broken. And the Nobel's committee sees that someone fights for those rights and thanks him or her for this attitude and for universal rights, because it's not about a particular rights or law, but universal ones. And this committee thanks this person but at the same time wants this person to be a winner, because the jury identifies itself with this person's ideals and encourage him or her. Some people consider that it's political, and others, that it's not. The fact in itself is political, but it's not simply politics.**

**(28) JP: The problem with Iran is that this country is left to itself and the other countries of the world don't want to help Iran because of the benefit they derive from its oil. And for example Great Britain benefits from this regime - they have very good relationship with the mullahs. We are thinking how it's possible to overthrow this regime without the other countries' help. It seems to me that Poland had support from abroad. First of all it was Pope.**

**(28) LW: But dear madame. Our fight was the fight against THE world-power, Super-power, nuclear weapons. This fight in Iran, in comparison with ours, is one-tenth of the scale. I mean – the weight of the fight. But here it's necessary to use different type of fight, it means – different way, style, organization. But it's much easier. In Iran to sort it out it's not a problem. I know – in five years, up to ten I'm able to smash any system, but...only if the truth is on my side. Because, you know, madame, in the name of falsehood it won't succeed. But in the name of rightness, human rights and necessities – five years and I destroy every system if i have all of that on my side. It's not important in which country it's happening. However in our country... We also had this truth with us, and the Pope, but there was nuclear super-power against us. There was two hundred thousand , or one hundred thousand – I don't remember, because I don't want to exaggerate – one hundred thousand Russian Sovietic soldiers, who guarded us. It was servitude. There was also milion soldiers around Poland and silos with a nuclear weapon. So, what is Iran. What is...**

**CLIP 04/04 FINISH**

**LW: ... what is this fight? This is very simple one and it's possible to settle this problem, but only under the condition that rightness is on the side of the majority. If the truth is on the majority side – I can smash any system. And I will find the method which will allow for it. But a few people have to set to work, really devote to the cause, think about it and lead effective fight. It is possible to do it in five years. And well... world is not interested today, you know madame, it's because, particularly Europe, fell into... Maybe... I'll say it in a different way – people develop, particularly in Europe, they develop stepwise and later they smoothly crawl. And when one performs a big jump, one doesn't have enough power for the next jump, because ones muscles will yield. And we made a huge jump from communism to capitalism and we can't make another one. Now we must organize ourselves, to dig ourselves in, to polish up... That is why we don't have enough strength to engage with someone else after this big jump. I can say that in Europe for five, ten years or after some time we will take care of Asia or maybe Africa but definitely Europe**

will have to get engaged, because we will have less problems in here. This European force will have to come out somewhere, maybe in Iran, maybe somewhere else.

**(29) JP:** Poland sent troops to Iraq. This is engagement...

**(29) LW:** You don't understand why they have done this, madame. And so, after this big jump, madame, it's clear that the world is organized in a bad way, that the UN, that EU, that position of United states is not defined. Because when there were two opponents, they kept an eye on each other and no one could do anything. And no one could go to Iraq if the Soviet Union existed. For sure it wouldn't happen. But after this big jump we don't know what is the US role and position. As it soon became evident, the US is very efficient in defending their affairs and a little bit of others affairs. But they don't have the right for war in Iraq, or anywhere else, they don't have the right, because the world didn't give them this right. But on the other side we have the UN, which has this right but it's not efficient, bureaucratic, and until today the UN didn't take a position. And when Poland is so experienced in fighting and see a danger – we will always support the efficient one. Poland must do it because our country knows what, from a single spark, can blow. And the attack on Washington and New York that was a very dangerous case, it was a scandal and it's necessary to teach those madmen a lesson, because that is not a way of fighting, what they've done. And it's necessary not to tolerate it, and thanks to the US for stopping these madmen, but only up to this point... States...

**(30) JP:** [But the ideology of] most madmen come from Iran...

**(30) LW:** But those mad people, you don't fight like that - with children, with civilians, it's not a fight, we can't allow anyone to do something like this. As a Noble prize winner, I first stand to fight with those mad people...

**(31) AK:** Some European countries, about half of them actually, are Monarchies, and half are Republics, such as Poland today. Further more, having studied the case of Solidarity and Poland, I see that Poland has a strong tradition of nobility and monarchy. Even in the time of Solidarity, some people would have compared Mr. Presidents behaviour in comparison to elected Polish monarch of the 16th Century and the national congress like the Polish nobility. I wonder what Mr. President opinion is of a Monarchical system as they exist in England and Spain and Japan today.

This to be asked in **OVERLAY Film on Polish Elected Monarchy.**

CLIP START

**(31) LW:** In every country there is the need for one constant element, not exchangable. Because with power is variability – messiness, anarchy... Whether it is needed or not today this element should exist, so people always could in the worst case come back to this element and he would be obliged to sort the country out.

**(32) JP:** Kind of a living symbol...

**(32) LW:** We can call him the king, cesar, chosen president, doesn't matter what, but it has to be constant element, which wouldn't blow around with the winds of history. If something is happening, for example people want a republic, no one can touch it, because the last decision belongs to this person, and the last activity. And this person will sort it out. If we don't have it, we are not covered. And there can be chaos and there is nothing sacrosant. One authority is needed. One person like that is very needed. And this person won't have too much power but will be the light in the dark.

(33) JP: It secures state stabilization, and stability of the cultures principles.

(33) LW: Does not get involved in politics, or ruling, but exists and everyone knows that in a certain condition the law is with this person. And this person stands above everything and no one can impair his authority. And doesn't rule but is there in case of danger.

(34) JP: Like the Queen of England?

(34) LW: Yes, or like the cesar of Japan.

[And in Poland question deleted]

(35) AK: VIDEO OVERLAY Picture of Pope.

The feeling in Iran today is of anger which may burst into mass violence, and it is perceived from the Solidarity movement, and especially from the guidance given by the Pope, that there was an emphasis on non-violence as violence might sabotage ones main objective. Possibly you could expand upon this matter. What was the influence of the Pope on the non-violent movement here.

(35) RE-IMPORT THIS Clip: LW: I was talking about it already. For twenty years I had ten people. And Pope woke up the nation, and I organized that and led the fight. But it was in Poland. I see that in Iran there is a will to fight, there is hatred...?

(36) JP: Yes, there is hatred...

(36) LW: But now, problem is here: where are the big human forces, but those simple people – workers, peasants, is it possible to organize them? On whom you could build the victory, which forces can secure victory, is shooting necessary?

(37) AK: Everyone seems convinced that it will eventually come to that.

(37) LW: Hmm, this is the simplest, the simplest. Why not election, self-governement or something like that?

(38) RE-IMPORT JP: Because elections in Iran are usually forged. Someone is always already chosen. International oversight is impossible. Unless the opposition organize their own elections, but in Iran the government dispose with opposition in quite a different way. They can execute, for example, thousands.

(38) LW: Is it possible?

(39) JP: Yes, but no one in the West talks about it. I've seen recently a documentary about torture in Iran. Film was done from hidden camera. And they showed how they gouge out somebody's eyes, how they cut people's hands. It's a bit of a different reality.

(39) LW: Indeed. Then I would do it in a different way. I would tell those biggest patriots not to engage, because it a waste of their fingers and hands. It ought to be organized in different way. It's necessary to do propaganda, to spread leaflets, to use press. It ought to be shown that sooner or later they will be squared up, that everyone who does these things to people will be responsible for his own actions. So he should imagine! And tell them – you are not the authority, you are only a tool, a knife. And you have to do propaganda, so you can impair their authority.

CLIP FINISH

LW: It's necessary to shake the controllability of the system. It has to be different fight, it's not possible... This fight, yes, in this situation only shooting remains. But people inside the country are not able to use force – it's necessary to do it from outside. But no one from outside of the country wants to do it in such a situation. So I think it's necessary to change the people's minds first - print leaflets, attack their militia and all of them. And tell them – „listen, you will be hanged if you don't resign. We created our group. Up to this moment we could understand you, but now we have our own group, and this group has prepared itself and it will overthrow this regime because there has been too much blood. And its better you don't interfere“. Something like that, it's necessary to lead the fight in this way. And it's not so difficult, only...

(40) JP: You mean that in the beginning it is best is to organize and prepare people psychologically for the fight.

(40) LW: Yes, propaganda is good, not demonstrations, because they will shoot, they will gouge out people's eyes. So what for? What for to incur within people a bigger dread? Step back and shake the authorities conciousness by long term propaganda. Talk about everything as it happened – you killed a man here, you will be responsible for it. Up to now you had to support the regime because there was no other organized force, you didn't have a choice but now you have, and remember that there is somebody who is writing down all your actions. And beware, all of you! Because then, we could understand you, now we won't forgive anyone. You are on the list, sergeant - you are on the list, governor – you are on the list, you will be responsible for your actions. If not today, you will be tomorrow. We count your days. So you should resign. **This is how it should be – more or less. I don't know, if I don't get angry and I go and from a place nearer to Iran I would lead your fight. Maybe, who knows, maybe fate will tell me to do it.**

(41) JP: We are wondering how could we hide those oppositionists who perform these actions, how to give leaflets to people, where...

(41) LW: Now there is technology, computers, one can send mails. Gather people – headquarter, e-mail multiply by itself, like in the lottery system. Gather wise people, a little bit of money and it will go.

(42) JP: Situation in Iran is like that, that some people fight, students demonstrate, and the rest stay at home and they drink alcohol [or take drugs], because alcohol is forbidden. This is their fight against regime.

(42) LW: **In our country the first people who fought were soldiers, generals, later students in all those demonstrations. Later workers in 1970, after all those experiences, and without those experiences it would have been impossible – we've done it all together. And here it's necessary to start from this point.** Propaganda has to be better because it seems to be too weak, and nowadays with the internet, you can send to all those chaps letters: „hey fellow you are on our list! And you are going to hang! There is only one question- when? Go away, resign, it's not your fault, it's the fault of this system and this conception, so better resign, otherwise you know!“

Well, is that everything?

(43) JP: And I think that Amir is the first Iranian who has come to see you...

(43) LW: I take it he is rather an oppositionist? So well, I wish you lots of successes and of course I'm able to help a lot, because I have great experience. Please take my bussiness card and you can keep in touch through the internet, maybe I will really get involved. But I don't know, because right now I'm a little bit tired and I have lots of problems. But I like it, and I would like to measure swords with someone again..