

**Patriarch Justinian, his Communist “Comrades,”
and the Trial of Commissioner Serghie Iandola,
Head of the Security Police Office of the
Râmnicu Vâlcea City Police**

Valentin LEANCĂ*

Abstract. Often in life, encounters between different people become memorable and seem like scenes from destiny. One such encounter may have been that between priest Ioan Marina and police officer Serghie Iandola. Information about Commissioner Serghie Iandola and his relationships with politicians of the time came to light after he published details of a foiled assassination attempt on Marshal Ion Antonescu in the Vâlcea press in 1992, and then in studies and papers published on the subject. The new state apparatus, based on totalitarian principles, could not function without purging all the personnel who had worked in these institutions during Ion Antonescu's rule, which required a careful "selection" of all those who had to be removed from office, then brought to trial and sentenced to long prison terms. Some of them managed to escape the repression and suffering imposed by the new political regime by joining the resistance movement, while others were lucky enough to have someone to save them or to have a witness with strength and credibility in the eyes of the courts to intervene in their trial.

Keywords: *the trial of Commissioner Serghie Iandola, Special Intelligence Service, Patriarch Iustinian Râmnicu Vâlcea city police*

DOI [10.56082/annalsarscihist.2026.1.54](https://doi.org/10.56082/annalsarscihist.2026.1.54)

Introduction

In recent decades, so much has been written about the establishment of the totalitarian socialist regime in Romania and its evolution in the first decade after Ion Antonescu was removed from power that one might think there are no more events or facts that could bring new information and perspectives for understanding this complex and contradictory historical period. There are still a huge number of documents and pieces of information in the archives in Romania that can improve the historical picture of the measures and policies through which the communist leaders built the new institutions of power of the future totalitarian socialist state: the army, the police, the gendarmerie, and the Special Intelligence Service. This state reconstruction was a lengthy process, considering that the totalitarian regime lasted just over four decades. The first phase involved a policy of "purging" "fascist elements" and replacing them with people loyal to the political interests of the

* *Romanian Scientific Society for Interdisciplinary Research.*

Communist Party¹. This began in the summer of 1944 and lasted until December 30th, 1947, when the monarchy was abolished as the form of organization of the Romanian state and the Romanian People's Republic was proclaimed. This was the period when all state institutions were taken under control, especially those considered to be powerful, through the application of totalitarian-Stalinist methods and instructions received from Soviet advisers who came to supplement the Red Army detachments of the occupying forces and ensure that Marxist-Leninist principles would be implemented until total victory was achieved. The main goal in this first phase was the disappearance of the rule of law and the material and spiritual degradation of Romanian society as a whole in order to control it. They carefully centralized and hierarchized the institutions, increasing their powers through increasingly restrictive legislative measures. Institutions were subjected to "excessive purging of so-called hostile, Hitlerite, and reactionary elements,"² which was, in fact, how all potential or actual opponents of the new regime³ were labeled. The new state apparatus, based on totalitarian principles, could not function without purging all the personnel who had worked in these institutions during Ion Antonescu's rule, which required a careful "selection" of all those who had to be removed from office⁴, then brought to trial and sentenced to long prison terms. Some of them managed to escape the repression and suffering imposed by the new political regime by joining the resistance movement, while others were lucky enough to have someone to save them or to have a witness with strength and credibility in the eyes of the courts to intervene in their trial. One such spectacular case was that of former police officer Serghie Iandola, who escaped a life sentence thanks to testimony in his favor from Patriarch Iustinian and two important Communist leaders from Râmnicu Vâlcea. This case was retried by the country's supreme court after 1990 because the 1955 ruling was found to have been based on abuses of justice by the communist regime and fundamental violations of the law at that time, resulting in a manifestly unfounded decision. The Supreme Court of Justice ruled in Decision No. 1567 in case No. 2559/1995 of June 20th, 1996, admitting the appeal for annulment filed by the Prosecutor General of Romania.

¹ Elis Neagoe, *Trecerea în rezervă a cadrelor M.A.I. între uz și abuz (1948 - 1965)* in Conf. univ. dr. Gheorghe Onișoru coord., *Totalitarism și rezistență, teroare și represiune în România comunistă*, București, 2001, pp. 62-65.

² Delia Cora, *Propaganda politică pentru și în timpul naționalizării comuniste*, in *Analele Banatului*, Arheologie – Istorie, vo. XXII, 2014, p. 476.

³ See more in, Dinu C. Giurescu, *Uzurpatorii. România 6 martie 1945 – 7 ianuarie 1946*, Editura Vremea XXI, București, 2004; Ghiță Ionescu, *Comunismul în România*, Editura Literera, București, 1994; Reuben H. Markham, *România sub jugul sovietic*, București Fundația Academia Civică, 1996; Dumitru Șandru, *Comunizarea societății românești în anii 1944–1947*, Editura Enciclopedică, București, 2007.

⁴ Liviu Țăranu, *Problema cadrelor în M.A.I. (1948-1965)*, in Gheorghe Onișoru, coord., *Totalitarism și rezistență, teroare și represiune în România*, București, 2001, pp. 28-40.

The subject of the retrial concerned a group of five police officers, agents at the Security Office in the city of Râmnicu Vâlcea, who in 1943-1944 carried out intense activity against the working class and the revolutionary movement. The acts **were only criminalized in 1954**, as they were considered to constitute elements of "crimes against the working class." Tried in the first instance by the Bucharest Territorial Military Court, defendants Gică Alexandru, Popescu Constantin, and Erițoiu Ion were sentenced in 1955 to five years and three years of hard labor, respectively. The latter two defendants benefited from mitigating circumstances in the individualization of their sentences. The sentence ordered the termination of the trial against the defendant Stănescu Gh. Ioan, who had died in the meantime, and the defendant Iandola Serghie was acquitted. Subsequently, the Military Tribunal for the Units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs rejected the appeals of the defendants Gică Alexandru and Erițoiu Ion. In order to unravel the intricacies of this case, it is necessary to briefly review the legislation and the changes it underwent between August 23rd, 1944, and the date of the trial.

1. Political and legal acts that legalized repression during the first decade of the totalitarian regime in Romania

The creation of a "legal" legal framework through which the communist leaders motivated their activity of repression and terror could not be achieved without consolidating the political power of the R.C.P. A first step was the "swallowing" of the pro-communist wing of the Social Democratic Party during the 6th "Congress" of the R.C.P. which took place on February 21st -23rd 1948. During this Congress, the main tasks and immediate needs facing the Party in order to establish a "people's democracy"⁵ regime were outlined among these is the creation of "popular justice". The year 1948 is considered to be decisive for the transformation of justice into a political instrument of the Gheorghiu-Dej regime⁶. The so-called reform of the legal system initiated by Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu in 1947 resulted in the purging of the judiciary of all hostile, counterrevolutionary elements who opposed the socialist order or were suspected of such acts. In November 1947, Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu⁷ proposed the draft law on the organization of the judiciary,

⁵ Nicoleta Ionescu-Gură, *Stalinizarea României. Republica Populară Română 1948 – 1950: transformări instituționale*, București (2005), p. 27.

⁶Cristina Roman, *Bazele legislative ale represiunii comuniste în România*, în **Anuarul IICCR** p. 66, online https://anuar.iiccr.ro/wpcontent/uploads/2022/11/Anuar_Vol1_CristinaRoman_65_82.pdf, accessed July 10, 2025.

⁷ For the activity of Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu as Minister of Justice starting with the government formed on August 23rd, 1944, see in detail, Gheorghe Onișoru, *Reflecții pe marginea cazului Pătrășcanu*, în *Xenopoliana*, VII, 1999, p. 92-103, online http://adxenopol.academiaromana-is.ro/xenopolitana/xeno_99_12/xeno_99_12_7.pdf accessed July 10 2025.

which was to be implemented on March 1st, 1948⁸. The new law repealed the three laws relating to the Court of Cassation, the Courts of Appeal, the tribunals, and the district courts, which had regulated the activity of the judiciary until that time. Lucrețiu Pătrășcanu, the author of the bill, stated at the time: "Through the presence of elected representatives of the working masses from towns and villages who become judges with decisive voting rights in tribunals and courts, justice truly becomes popular."⁹ The provisions of the law required magistrates to apply party policy in accordance with the interests they had at that stage of Romanian society's development: "judges must defend the interests of the working class, protect the new democracy, and punish the enemies of the people."¹⁰ There was also a new development in the field of law. The law provided for the introduction in all courts, except those of the Court of Cassation and Justice, of popular assessors whose task was to oversee how the law was applied in the interests of the class struggle. This legislative act also transformed the Public Prosecutor's Office into the Public Ministry, directly subordinate to the Minister of Justice, and introduced the position of people's prosecutor, who was to work within the courts, where they were to present conclusions in criminal cases or cases "of public interest."¹¹ Decree No. 187 of April 30, 1949 amended the content of Article 1 with a provision so general that anyone could be charged and tried on the basis of generalities or unsubstantiated accusations: "The purpose of criminal law is to defend the People's Republic of Romania and its legal order against acts dangerous to society by applying measures of social defense against persons who commit such acts."¹² The acts that were considered dangerous were not defined, nor was the category of social defense measures or what social defense meant. The early 1950s were a period of continuous political pressure on the justice system. The demands of class struggle seemed not to have been fully understood by part of the judiciary, which is why the leaders of the Romanian Workers' Party (R.W.P) claimed the permanent need to consolidate party control.¹³ The year 1952 is considered to be a turning point in the

⁸ Law No. 17 of February 12, 1948, OFFICIAL GAZETTE No. 35 of February 12, 1948, online <https://legislatie.just.ro/public/DetaliiDocument/22740> accessed July 10, 2025.

⁹ Quoted after Florian Banu, *Instrumentalizarea justiției de către regimul comunist (1945-1958)*, în **Caietele CNSAS** Revistă semestrială editată de Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității, Anul II, nr. 2(4)/2009, p. 127.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*.

¹¹ *Ibidem*.

¹² Valentin-Stelian Bădescu, Liviu Done, *Unele considerații privind dreptul penal românesc în perioada regimului comunist. Tranziția postcomunistă și reconstrucția justiției române. Poziții actuale privind identitatea națională și procesul integrării europene, Partea a II-a*, in **Acta Universitatis George Bacovia. Juridica**, vol. 8, Issue 2/2019, online https://www.ugb.ro/Juridica/Issue16ROEN/1_Dreptul_penal_romanesc_in_perioada_regimului_comunist.Partea_II.Badescu.RO.pdf accessed July 10, 2025.

¹³ Florian Banu, *op. cit.*, in *loc.cit.*, p. 141.

finalization of a legal instrument that served as a weapon for the R.W.P.¹⁴ Methods and means were sought to further expand the scope of action against those suspected or guilty of acts against the regime. Thus, Law No. 7 of June 19, 1952, on the organization of military courts and prosecutors' offices¹⁵ introduced an article whereby civilians could also be tried by such special courts. The laws of the interwar period clearly specified the conditions under which these courts could try civilians during wartime or social unrest. Article 9 of the law adopted in June 1952 established: Military courts for large units and territorial military courts shall only judge on the merits, having the following jurisdiction:

1. Military courts for large units shall judge crimes committed by military personnel with the rank of soldier, sailor, sergeant, corporal, or junior officer, except for the military personnel referred to in point 2(a) of this article.

2. Territorial military courts shall judge: a) crimes committed by military and militarized personnel with the rank of soldier, sailor, sergeant, corporal, or junior officer, who are part of the units and formations of the Ministry of State Security and the Ministry of Internal Affairs; b) crimes committed by civilians, which are referred by law to the jurisdiction of military courts; c) crimes against state security, in which civilians and any other persons, regardless of their status, participated.¹⁶

Very interesting for understanding how justice in the 1950s functioned as an instrument of repression and how communist leaders sought to cover up these abuses was the legislation, the issuance of criminal law acts without making the decrees and their content public¹⁷. In general, a law comes into force upon its publication, unless a later date is expressly provided for. The "people's democracy" regime had no problem in keeping repressive criminal legislation secret, ignoring both the basic legal principle of the legality of criminalization and punishment and that of the non-retroactivity of criminal law. Thus, *Decree 62/1954* (unpublished in the Official Gazette of the People's Republic of Romania) was drafted, amending the previous penal code to introduce new content to *Article 193 (1)*. Its provisions were known only to the "political and judicial oligarchy," court presidents, chief prosecutors, and senior Securitate officials¹⁸ and it had the following content:

¹⁴ Iuliu Crăcană, *Drept și Justiție în România comunistă (III). Un conflict între două instituții represive - Securitatea și Procuratura*, in **Caietele CNSAS** Revistă semestrială editată de Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității, Anul VI, nr. 1-2(11-12)/2013, p. 191.

¹⁵ *Legea nr. 7 din 19 iunie 1952 (*republicată*)*, **BULETINUL OFICIAL**, nr. 8 din 4 martie 1953, online <https://legislatie.just.ro/Public/DetaliiDocument/46514> accessed July 10, 2025.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*.

¹⁷ Iuliu Crăcană, *Drept și justiție în România comunistă (II)*, in **Caietele CNSAS** Revistă semestrială editată de Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității, anul IV, nr. 1-2 (7-8)/2011, pp. 57-61.

¹⁸ See the text in Iuliu Crăcană, *op. cit.*, in *loc. cit.*, p. 69.

Paragraph 1. "Intense activity against the working class and the revolutionary movement, carried out in a position of responsibility in the state apparatus or in a secret service during the bourgeois-landlord regime, shall be punished by life imprisonment and total confiscation of property."

Paragraph 2. "If the act referred to in the preceding paragraph was committed in a position other than one of responsibility, the punishment shall be imprisonment for 5 to 25 years and total or partial confiscation of property."

Why was it necessary to introduce new provisions? Romulus Rusan also provided an answer to this question. According to him, in view of Romania's admission to the UN, the communists tried to bring some "order" to the Gulag records and—because there were many people who had not been tried and had been in detention since 1948, since 1950, since 1952—they found a solution by adding a secret article to the Penal Code, which, contrary to any principle of law, acted retroactively. Obviously, resorting to these retroactive convictions, with sentences already served, did nothing to make communist justice any more legal¹⁹. Romulus Rusan's assessment is supported by documents in the archives concerning individuals who were imprisoned without trial and conviction at the time of their deprivation of liberty²⁰, as was the case with the group of police officers in Râmnicu Vâlcea.

2. The “meeting” between Ioan Marina/Patriarch Justinian and police commissioner Serghe Iandola

Often in life, encounters between different people become memorable and seem like scenes from destiny. One such encounter may have been that between priest Ioan Marina and police officer Serghe Iandola. Information about Commissioner Serghe Iandola and his relationships with politicians of the time came to light after he published details of a foiled assassination attempt on Marshal Ion Antonescu²¹ in the Vâlcea press in 1992²², and then in studies and papers published on the subject.²³

¹⁹ Romulus Rusan, *Cronologia și geografia represiunii. Recensământul populației concentraționare din România (1945-1989)*, Fundația Academia Civică, 2007, online <https://www.memorialsighet.ro/romulus-rusan-cronologia-i-geografia-represiunii-recensmantul-populaiei-concentraionare-din-romania-1945-1989-3/> accessed July 10, 2025.

²⁰ Arhiva Consiliului Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității, fond P-137107, vol. 7, f. 55. În continuare se va cita ACNSAS, fond, vol., f.

²¹ Ion Măldărescu, *80 de ani de la „Atentat la Mareșal”*, in **Art-Emis.ro**, 28 Iulie 2024, online <https://www.art-emis.ro/istorie/80-de-ani-de-la-atentat-la-maresal> accessed July 10, 2025

²² Serghe Iandola, *Memoriile fostului șef al Siguranței vâlcene*, în **Curierul de Vâlcea** nr. 968 din 13-14 nov.1993.

²³ See, Cristian Troncotă, *Atentate dejucate*, în **Dosarele istoriei**, nr. 5/2000, pp. 51-53; Sorin Oane, *Atentatul dejucat de la Olănești contra mareșalului Antonescu. O variantă de lucru*, **Buridava**, Muzeul Județean „Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu”, Vâlcea, nr. 7, 2009, pp. 226-232; Florian Bichir, *Atentat*

Ioan Marina was a country priest who, in the political circumstances of the mid-20th century, proved to be an opportunist who converted to communism after August 23rd, 1944. His human qualities do not classify him as a simple "country priest." After graduating from seminary and being ordained, he continued his studies at the Faculty of Theology in Bucharest. For eight years, he was a priest and teacher in the village of Olteanca in the commune of Băbeni. In 1933, when he was only 32 years old, he was appointed parish priest of the Church of St. George in Râmnicu Vâlcea. During this period, he held the positions of director of the Seminary and of the Episcopal Printing House in Râmnic, and contributed articles to magazines and newspapers.²⁴ Having left-wing convictions, he participated in two meetings of the International Anti-Fascist Committee held in Geneva in 1936 and in Paris in 1938 as a member of the National Peasant Party. Metropolitan Bartolomeu V. Anania, a close associate of Patriarch Justinian, whom he evoked with unwavering devotion, said and wrote that priest Ioan Marina would not have met with Gheorghiu-Dej on August 24th (certainly before the 23rd) August 1944 if the car in which he was traveling after escaping from the camp in Târgu Jiu had not broken down near the home of priest Marina, who sheltered him there for several hours²⁵. Being a supporter of Ion Mihalache's left-wing, peasantist line, he also flirted with the illegal communist movement, often organizing separate conspiratorial meetings of both parties and even of the Legionnaires in his home, with Father Marina enjoying the protection of the city's police and security chiefs.²⁶ During this period, it is possible that the two got to know each other very well and developed a relationship of mutual trust. Benefiting from political credit as a result of the help he gave Gheorghiu-Dej in his escape from the camp in Târgu Jiu in August 1944, the priest Ioan Marina from Vâlcea had a meteoric career, becoming Patriarch of Romania in just three years (May 1949), after a short period spent in Iași, first as vicar bishop (1945-1947) and then as metropolitan of Moldova (1947-1948).²⁷

The documents in the archives contain testimonies from various individuals who claim that priest Ioan Marina was also a sympathizer of the radical left and was protected by Commissioner Serghie Iandola (Appendices 2, 3).

la Mareșal. Olănești, 28 iulie 1944. Ion Antonescu - ținta parașutiștilor sovietici, București, Editura RAO, 2015.

²⁴ Sorin Oane, *Istoria comunismului vâlcean până la 23 august 1944*, in **Buridava**. Studii si materiale, vol. XI, Râmnicu Vâlcea, 2013-2014, p. 243.

²⁵ Bartolomeu Anania, *Amintiri despre Patriarhul Justinian*, in **Revista BOR**, nr. 3/2017, pp. 363-389, <https://www.revistabor.ro/wp-content/uploads/restituiri-amintiri-despre-P-Justinian.pdf> . accessed July 9, 2025

²⁶ Sorin Oane, op.cit., in loc.cit., p. 243.

²⁷ Dragoș Ursu, *Patriarhul Justinian (1948-1977) și reintegrarea socioprofesională a clericilor, foști deținuți politici. Strategii, compromisuri și adaptări*, in **Terra Sebus**. Acta Musei Sabesiensis, vol. 11, 2019, p. 492.

3. Arrest and investigation of security police officers in Râmnicu Vâlcea.

The documents in the criminal case file show that the five members of the group of security police agents from Râmnicu Vâlcea were not arrested at the same time. Two of them, Serghie Iandola and Stănescu Gh. Ioan, had been deprived of their liberty since July 1948 on the basis of Order 26,500 of the State Security Directorate of July 15, 1948. In fact, on the night of July 26/27, 1948, over a thousand people were arrested by the police and gendarmerie and imprisoned in the penitentiaries of Pitești, Craiova, Făgăraș, and Târgșor.²⁸ The hypothesis we considered in researching the role played by Patriarch Justinian in the trial of Serghie Iandola and his subordinates, is that the sentence handed down to those tried and convicted was not based on evidence prepared by prosecutors in accordance with professional ethics, but on the amendment to Article 193(1) of the Criminal Code.

The investigations were conducted by security officer Lt. Cricopol Ion, assisted in some hearings by Lt. Maj. Szirmai Iuliu and Lt. Micuțelu Iuliu. The case file contained no material evidence, but rather evidence that had been "constructed" by the investigators through the interrogation of communists who had allegedly suffered as a result of the defendants' "intense" activities against the working class.

One of the communists from Vâlcea, Hin Ion, a carpenter by profession, stated in his testimony given to investigators on November 26, 1953, that "he was slapped by Iandola Serghie" without providing any details. The witness was summoned again the next day and re-interviewed. This time, he remembered the circumstances in which he was struck: "In 1943, an individual named Mihai was in my workshop... as well as Enache Achim and Ferari Iosif from Rm. Vâlcea, both of whom are now deceased. During discussions, Enache said that General Paulus was a fool and was being beaten by the Russians. The aforementioned Mihai informed security of this, and Ferari Iosif was questioned as a witness and admitted to the above. When questioned as a witness, I stated that it was not true that Enache had said the above and that, on the contrary, he had said that General Paulus was a good commander."²⁹ Since the witness did not indicate the "evidence," i.e., the circumstances in which he was allegedly struck, the investigator "leads" the witness to the desired answer by asking the question: What were the circumstances and reasons why you were struck by Commissioner Iandola Serghie? The witness claims that he was beaten "because I did not want to sign the report in the sense indicated by Ferari Iosif, Commissioner Iandola Serghie slapped me."³⁰ The

²⁸ See also Florin Șinca, *Martirii poliției române. Distrugerea poliției sub regimul comunist*, RCR Editorial, București, 2014, pp. 54-56.

²⁹ ACNSAS, fond P-137107, vol 1, f. 203.

³⁰ *Ibidem*.

statements had no probative value because, as the witness stated, "Only Ferari Iosif, who is now deceased, was present." ³¹

In the course of gathering evidence, another communist, Chirtop Petre, a carpenter by trade, was also heard as a witness. He too had been "terrorised" by Commissioner Serghie Iandola. He claims that he was interrogated by Iandola following denunciations by people from the localities of Păușești-Măglași and Olănești in 1941 for allegedly spreading subversive communist propaganda. This witness's account was legally much less valuable in establishing Iandola's guilt. On this occasion, Commissioner Iandola Serghie drew up a report in which I was to admit that I had carried out subversive propaganda. I refused to sign it, claiming that it was not true. Iandola Serghie began shouting and threatening me to make me sign. When I refused to sign, he drew up another report in which he changed only the wording, but which was essentially still an admission of my actions. I didn't want to sign this statement either, so Commissioner Iandola Serghie started shouting even more, threatening me in every way possible to intimidate me into signing. I didn't want to sign this report either, so he started swearing at me and threatening to lock me up. He drew up a third report, which I also refused to sign, but he insisted and swore at me, threatening me in such a way that I signed it with the note that I had been forced to do so. ³² Because he refused to sign the statements, "Commissioner Iandola Serghie persecuted me by sending me under escort to the Craiova Court Martial without allowing me to go home with an escort to get some money, clothes, food..." ³³

Himler Iosif, a carpenter by trade, was also questioned, but after the 1946 elections he would become mayor of Râmnicu Vâlcea³⁴. It shows, in summary, that "he had been involved in communist activities since 1933. In 1943, a worker was arrested on the orders of Iandola Serghie for allegedly expressing hostility towards the regime at the time. That also in 1943 or 1944, the accused Iandola allegedly tried to get him to betray the communists in R. Vâlcea by setting a trap for him. After August 23rd, Iandola Serghie allegedly intervened with the army to suppress the demonstration of sympathy by some workers." ³⁵ Văcaru Dumitru, a civil servant, told investigators who were "building" evidence for Commissioner Iandola that "he had been arrested by the commissioner on the basis of an order from the Sibiu Police Headquarters. His arrest was followed by the detention of 12 other workers, who were released on the same day, also on orders from Sibiu. His wife was helped by the commissioner to bring him packages with the necessary items.

³¹ *Ibidem*.

³² *Ibidem*, f. 200.

³³ *Ibidem*.

³⁴ Sorin Oane, *Istoria comunismului vâlcean...*, pp. 230-231.

³⁵ ACNSAS, fond P-137107, vol 1, f. 200.

He was physically assaulted, but not by the commissioner or any other defendant in the case.”³⁶

The security investigator and military prosecutor Lt. Oprea Ilie from the Bucharest Territorial Military Prosecutor's Office, who drafted the indictment, considered that “by attaching service orders, the activity of Iandola Serghie and his subordinates who supervised the suspects, sometimes conducting raids or searches, corroborated by the statements of the above witnesses, carried out intense activities to oppress the working class and the labor movement, and through their activities contributed to maintaining the bourgeois-landlord regime and the fascist dictatorship.”³⁷”

From the above and other information in the case file, it appears that, from a legal perspective, in the best-case scenario, the criminal investigation was conducted by individuals with little experience in such a profession, probably at the beginning of their careers. The closest thing to the truth is that this was done because it was known that in the trial of Serghie Iandola, the accuracy of the evidence and the indictment was of no importance. The practice of those years showed this. Not all persons listed as suspected of communist activity were heard, no confrontations were held to clarify contradictions, especially since the defendants were in preventive detention relatively close by, at the Pitești penitentiary, no evidence was requested for the defense, emphasis was placed on factual aspects that were legally irrelevant or easily refutable, no documents were sought to prove any incriminating facts, and the legal provisions regarding the powers of the police authorities at that time were completely ignored, etc. Interestingly, eight police officers detained in Făgăraș, Pitești, or in the hard labor colony/camp in Saligny (Danube-Black Sea Canal) were also questioned in this case. The interrogations show that absolutely nothing was obtained from them to prove the facts for which the defendants in the Iandola case were being investigated. Another aspect of the dilettantism is that of the multiple hearings of the accused without obtaining concrete data and facts. Commissioner Iandola was questioned a total of 21 times by the lead investigator, six times on October 30th, 1953, and only in five statements did he refer directly to the case, some of them with dark humor. The minutes of the interrogation on March 8th, 1954, record:

Question: You told me that you had some additions to make to the interrogation report dated March 5th, 1954. What additions do you have to make?

Answer: I remembered that while I was working for the Caracal Police, I beat an arrested person.

Question: Under what circumstances did you hit him, and who was that person?

³⁶ *Ibidem*, f. 451.

³⁷ *Ibidem*, f. 458.

Answer: In 1938, while on duty at the Caracal Police Station, a man named Gică Speriātu was in custody for burglary. At his request, I allowed him to go to the toilet, at which point he escaped. I searched for him to arrest him, and two weeks later he was apprehended. Being brought to the police headquarters, I beat him by slapping him twice. Also, Speriātu Gică was beaten by the guard Ioniță Dumitru who had been on duty with me that night at the police station. This was the only case of a man I beat at the Caracal Police.³⁸

4. The judgment and... testimonies of the rescue of Commissioner Serghie Iandola

After carrying out the necessary procedures to start the trial, on September 13th, 1954, the first trial term took place in the city of Pitești. All the defendants under arrest were present, except for Stănescu Gh. Ioan, who died in prison. The defendants, through their defense attorneys, requested evidence in their defense to prove the extent of their innocence, regarding some of the imputed acts and also their behavior during the time they worked in the former bourgeois police. The military prosecutor of the hearing did not oppose the requested evidence.

The defendant Iandola Serghie "also requested a piece of evidence with documents to establish that those proposed for internment (in the camp - n.n.), the painting (table - n.n.) it is not made by him"³⁹. The court admitted the evidence with witnesses, but as for the evidence with documents requested by Iandola, it was rejected. The panel of judges motivated the rejection because the defendant did not specify where the documents he wanted to use could be found and considered that it is done in a spirit of harassment and with the aim of delaying the trial of the case.⁴⁰ At this time of the trial, only four of the six witnesses proposed by the defense appeared. For those who were not present, the defense waived their hearing. The prosecution submitted to the court a file containing photocopies of orders and service reports, information notes from the period 1943-1944 from which the intense activity against the working class would result (Annex 4).

The next trial date was set for December 23rd, 1954. The minutes of the court hearing from this term show that the defendants assisted by the two lawyers were heard.

Iandola Serghie presented the main moments of his police career and admitted that he issued service orders to supervise elements suspected of communist activities, but these were given based on superior orders received. Finally, he admitted that it was his signature on the documents contained in the attached file⁴¹. Witnesses Himler Iosif and Văcaru Dumitru maintained their

³⁸ *Ibidem*, f. 170.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, f. 482

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 482 verso.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, f. 546.

previous statements⁴². Anton Diaconescu, a shoemaker by profession, a witness in circumstance, made a statement that was in Commissioner Iandola's favor: "Regarding the period in which the accused Iandola Serghie worked as head of security, I was not arrested during that time and I am not aware of any worker being mistreated. In 1946, I personally gave a certificate in which I showed that Iandola Serghie had a good behavior and helped the workers. From hearsay I know that Iandola Serghie would have known about the activity carried out by priest Marina Ion (currently His Holiness Patriarch Justinian Marina), as well as by comrade Mihail Roșianu"⁴³. Another circumstantial witness, Sami Stern, a civil servant, declared before the court that it is true that he hosted, with the knowledge of the accused Iandola, a citizen who came from a camp, that the accused personally did not do him any harm, that in 1944 several Jews were listening to the London radio station and were surprised by Iandola Serghie, who did not do anything to them, that during the legionnaires' time, a group of Jews from Iași were hosted by certain people from Râmnicu Vâlcea, a fact known to Iandola Serghie, who did not take any measures.⁴⁴

Having exhausted this moment of administering testimonial evidence, the court gave the floor to the prosecution for the final conclusions. The military prosecutor "orally developed the indictment and, analyzing the evidence administered in the case and the documents in the file with documents, regarding the defendant Iandola Serghie, highlights that he had an intense activity against the working class and the revolutionary movement, that he exceeded his official duties and had personal initiatives regarding the labor and revolutionary issue - he demands his conviction"⁴⁵. Iandola Serghie's lawyer, Nicolaevici Vasile "asks to analyze whether the elements required by art. 193/1 par. 1 of the criminal code are met since it does not appear that he had a personal initiative but on the contrary, as the defendant states, he would have had connections with communist elements who were fighting illegally and that he helped these elements and supported them within the limits of his service possibilities, although in reality, in order to mislead his superiors, he made some notes, but these after previously knowing the pursued ones so that they could evade prosecution. As for the arrest of witness Văcaru, he did it on the orders of the Sibiu police station, as well as those of the 12 workers. He requests broad mitigating circumstances."⁴⁶

After the lawyers' plea, the court gave the last word to the defendants. The theatrical coup belonged to Iandola who, taking the floor first, firmly showed that "he did not carry out an activity against the working class elements, but on the

⁴² *Ibidem*, ff. 550-551.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, f. 552.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, f. 553.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, f. 554.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, f. 556.

contrary he helped the working class, namely His Holiness Patriarch Justinian Marina and the Roșianu brothers (father and son in reality - n.n.), who could show what the help he gave consisted of and asked for acquittal."⁴⁷ The change in the commissioner's procedural attitude was premeditated and preceded by the testimony of circumstantial witness Anton Diaconescu, who stated that, "from hearsay, he knows that Iandola Serghie was aware of the activity carried out by priest Marina Ion (currently His Holiness Patriarch Justinian Marina), as well as by comrade Mihail Roșianu."⁴⁸ The court retired for deliberation and decided to postpone the ruling until after Father Christmas and New Year, on January 10th, 1955⁴⁹. The total change in attitude of the panel of judges is surprising because previously (at the hearing on September 13th, 1954) Iandola requested documentary evidence and the court rejected his request, considering that it was made in a spirit of harassment and with the aim of delaying the trial of the case, and now it forced him to write a...detailed memorandum⁵⁰ !

On January 10th, 1955, the trial panel received Iandola's 23-page memorandum and "found that in order to find the objective truth (!) it was necessary to hear three witnesses"⁵¹. The case was rescheduled for January 13th, 1955, during which the witnesses His Holiness Justinian Marina, the Patriarch of Romania, Roșianu Mihail and Roșianu Ionel were "heard", for which purpose "the Tribunal will travel to their residences on January 11th, 1955."⁵² It is worth noting the utmost speed of the trial panel, something rare in those times. According to the notes of the trial panel, it would have traveled on the appointed day to the Patriarchate and to the workplaces of the two Roșianu. In reality, the witnesses were "heard" prior to the court date. The typewritten statements in the file are identical to the handwritten ones that Patriarch Iustinian recorded 'manu propria' on January 5th, 1955, as did Roșianu Ionel on January 9th, 1955. Probably Mihail Roșianu also on January 9th (Annexes 1-3). Such actions by the court not only violated the most elementary norms of conducting a criminal trial even in the context of the totalitarian socialist criminal legislation of that time (the rights of other defendants, the presence of lawyers, equality before the law, the administration of evidence, unfairness, etc.), but they could constitute criminal acts.

On the date of January 13th, 1955, the case was retried, the defendants being formally re-heard, all claiming that they maintained their previous statements. The military prosecutor was then given the floor, who in his conclusions argued that regarding the accused Iandola Serghie, he reverted to the conclusions made in the

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 566.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, f. 567.

⁵² *Ibidem*.

hearing of December 23rd, 1954, because following the evidence administered, it was found that he was close to the working class, helped the working-class elements who were fighting illegally. He requested the acquittal of Iandola. Regarding the other defendants, he maintained the conclusions made in the hearing of December 23rd, 1954, requesting the conviction of the defendants. The defense, regarding the accused Iandola Serghie, shows that the defendant was sincere and the testimonies of the witnesses heard after the case was re-opened confirmed the sincerity of the defendant's statements. The court presents in the considerations of the decision the reasons that led to the acquittal of the defendant Iandola. Regarding the accusations of Himler Iosif that Iandola had arrested a worker (named Achim-n.n.) in the workshop of Hin Ion, the court believes the commissioner that the worker was not...a worker "but a bourgeois who owned an entire block of houses with about 20 apartments and who was not a leftist element either"⁵³. Regarding witness Hin Ion, the panel concludes that he "was not a genuine communist but an agent of the Gestapo, he contributed to raising funds to support the war against the USSR as a member of the German ethnic group, he was married to Grundisch Gustav, a resident of the Gestapo in Rm. Vâlcea"⁵⁴. The report made by Iandola regarding Chirtop Petre is taken into account, according to which "he only completed the investigations carried out by the gendarmes from Olănești and that the aforementioned did not respect the ban on leaving Rm. Valcea but did not send him to the camp"⁵⁵. Regarding the accusation that Iandola had detained and investigated 10 workers in the police yard, the court panel noted that they "were free in the yard with their families... and that on the contrary, he ordered the factory to pay them their salary for the two days they were absent, and that none of those workers were in the least offended..."⁵⁶.

Following these new interpretations of the testimonies, the court notes that the defendant Iandola "during the period he worked in the security office of the Valcea City Police - not only did he not carry out intense activity against communist and worker elements, but on the contrary, numerous cases have been proven in which the defendant had attitudes and activities carried out with great courage in favor of anti-fascists, suspected communists and workers from Vâlcea"⁵⁷. The panel of judges did not find "in the accused Iandola Serghie an intense activity within the meaning of the provisions of article 193, index 1 of the criminal code, but on the contrary an intense activity in favor of communist and worker elements, so the court will pronounce his acquittal of any penalty in the present case."⁵⁸

⁵³ *Ibidem*, f. 559.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, f. 556

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, ff. 561, 590.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, f. 591.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, f. 593.

The judges who saved Iandola, in full agreement with the prosecutors of the Bucharest Territorial Military Prosecutor's Office, had no problem finding that the other defendants, who acted as subordinates of the commissioner, "were aware that their activity represented a fight against communist and worker elements, which results both from their admissions and from the materiality of the facts."⁵⁹ The defendants were tried based on Soviet criminal doctrine, which took into account the existence of the subjective side of the crime, according to which it was sufficient for those in question to have been aware that their activity represented a fight against communist and working-class elements, regardless of whether their activity was carried out for material interest or for other personal reasons. Regarding the defendants' defenses formulated by lawyers regarding the circumstance that "the situation of the accused Iandola Serghie would influence the situation of these three defendants in the sense of an exoneration of liability since he was their boss, the court finds that it is unfounded, since while in the Iandola case there were proven concrete and repeated cases of actions in favor of communist and worker elements, as well as that he did not follow the orders received, the same thing was not proven regarding these three defendants."⁶⁰

Conclusions

Archival documents and studies published to date indicate that the amendment of the Criminal Code by communist leaders in the first decade of the totalitarian regime was done to streamline an instrument of repression and not to modify a legal act in order to draw up an act of justice based on good moral, ethical and civic codes.⁶¹ In that decade, from the perspective of the act of justice, a denunciation could send you to prison, and a testimony from a prestigious citizen, influential in the era, as the case of Commissioner Iandola's trial shows, could save you from difficult years in prison.

The common experiences of Commissioner Iandola and the important witnesses in the trial during the period 1941-1944 in Vâlcea County, the way in which the trial court ordered the administration of the evidence in question after neither Iandola nor his lawyer had the courage to request it during the criminal investigation or at the beginning of the trial, the sudden change in the attitude of the trial panel towards the commissioner after his last word, the court's performance of procedural acts in clear violation of the law, lead to the idea that Commissioner Iandola's late "confession" created a succession of influential interventions, which required the involvement of the mutual friend of the two powerful men of the time

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, f. 594.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁶¹ A se vedea, Ioan Dan, *Procesul Mareșalului Ion Antonescu*, Editura Lucman, București, 2005 pp. 48-50.

(Marina and Roșianu), up to the first secretary of the communist party Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej, in order to save himself from an imminent sentence to heavy life imprisonment. Dej proved that he had not forgotten his collaborators who helped him escape from the Târgu Jiu camp and then hid him in Râmnicu Vâlcea in August 1944, ensuring his protection.

ANNEXES

**Annex 1.
Bucharest Territorial Military Court
File 1079/1954**

MINUTE STATEMENT

Drafted today, January 11th, 1955, by the panel of judges sent to the Patriarchate

WITNESS DEPOSITION

Witness proposed by the accused **Iandola Serghie**

Name and pronouns of the witness: **Patriarch of People’s Republic of Romania, Justinian Marina**

...swearing according to the law, after being warned that if he did not tell the truth he would be guilty of perjury, he made the following deposition, reproduced in summary by the clerk:

I first met Serghie Iandola from his anti-fascist demonstrations.

When the legionary movement came to power, **Iandola did not commit acts of servility. He had troubles, was suspended, then transferred, and his wife was expelled from education. These sufferings brought him closer to the anti-fascists in Vâlcea, whose leader I was, and his relationship with me became even closer.**

After the legionnaires' rebellion, he came back to Râmnicu Vâlcea. **I insisted with some friends who were officials at the Ministry of Education that Iandola's wife be accepted into education. They only gave her half-time classes.**

Iandola's behavior during the legionary movement and my knowledge of his anti-fascist sentiments gained and increased my trust in him. However, he still had to provide other evidence, because he was in the police and doubt in the police was legitimate.

The war against the USSR began. Iandola was from Basarabia. He was put under observation. **However, he did not manifest feelings of joy and attachment towards this war and more than once he openly showed his opposition to this war and his confidence in the defeat of the fascists. He was proud of the victories of Tymoshenko, who was from his village and even a relative of his.**

One day in the city of Râmnicu Vâlcea, military bands came out to the parks and sang. Passing in front of the prefecture, in the yard of the girls' high school next to the prefecture, after the music there was a big dance. **I met Iandola in the street. From him I learned that the German-Romanian fascist armies had occupied Odessa and that was why there was music and games. But he did not hide his disgust for such joys.**

The links between the anti-fascists were greatly hampered by the measures taken to not travel by train except on the basis of an authorization issued by the gendarmes in the countryside and by the police in the cities. **Iandola gave us authorizations, sometimes we asked him for blank authorizations, asking him not to ask who he was giving them to. He gave them to us and did not inquire about the beneficiary. He provided us with these services throughout the war.**

In 1942-1943 and 1944, public sit-ins were organized by the City Cultural Center. The lecturers were mostly from the ranks of anti-fascists. The programs were anti-fascist and anti-German in nature. In 1943 and 1944, also within the City Cultural Center, a Popular University was established where the most ardent anti-German and anti-fascist professors of the University of Cluj who had fled to Sibiu held conferences. Almost all the conferences ended with public anti-fascist and anti-German demonstrations with cries of "shame on the Germans", down with Hitler's Germany", etc.

Iandola pretended not to see or hear. Some of the anti-fascist members, for example Iosef Andreescu, had started a public propaganda against the USSR, disregarding the conspiratorial regulations of the anti-fascist movement, endangering the organized activity and the leaders.

Because of this, the party accused them of provocation. **Iandola informed us and the zealous were tempered. Through Iandola I knew a large part of the Gestapo agents, of whom I warned the members to be careful and not to let themselves be provoked.** Many of the legionnaires were in the service of the Gestapo and denounced the anti-fascists. In the fall of 1943 (in reality 1942-n.n.) Ionel Roșianu, the son of Mihail Roșianu - together with his roommate were denounced by another legionnaire colleague with a written denunciation, that he saw communist books and newspapers in their possession. During the search, the police found only Brăileanu's book "The Art of Governing" - which - the one who had picked up the incriminated ones a few hours earlier had considered harmless.

In this book, however, Ionel Roșianu and his colleague (Young Communist League members) had noted their opposing opinions on the margin, quoting Stalin, etc. It was a difficult moment. Mihail Roșianu was still focused, and Cumpănașu did not want to approach the police.

I went to Iandola. The students were being investigated by Andreescu C. The book contained obvious evidence through their handwritten notes. **I asked Iandola for support, also appealing to his friendship with Mihail Roșianu.**

The only salvation was to erase the worst parts overnight. Iandola erased them. The students were released the next day. The informant complained to Craiova. The investigation came. By the time of the investigation, the rest of the notes had been corrected. After August 23rd, I showed Iandola all my gratitude, confessing the truth to him because he had saved the Young Communist League organization in Vâlcea and maybe even more.

From the beginning, but especially from 1943, which culminated in the incident of the arrest of the students, Iandola realized that there were also communists among the anti-fascists. As early as 1942, on the occasion of some authorizations, he asked me about my attitude towards the communists, alluding to the visits that Himmler and Mișu Stănculescu and others paid me. I used this opportunity to gain his goodwill for the communists, for the workers, as those who would achieve more, pursued by the Gestapo and the police.

Iandola's soul was favorable and he promised not only that he would be just and honest and that he would help them with everything in his power. I advised him not to give his whole heart to communists like Himler, Hihu (probably Hin-n.n.), Mișu Stănculescu and even Belu and Văcaru, because they are not yet completely verified, but also to defend them, if necessary, without them knowing.

Iandola kept his word. He approached the workers, supported them. No one was roughed up, hit, etc.

He would have yelled and threatened again, saying that he was just in the police service and if he didn't do it either, they would fire him. Even I advised him to be more vocal sometimes.

At the beginning of 1944, Mihail Roșianu came from the concentration camp. **Iandola was asked by me and Roșianu to keep us informed of all the circulars and orders regarding anti-fascists and communists. Iandola kept his word. He gave a lot of information and the reports he made were according to the suggestions given by me.**

I will only mention a few - in connection with concrete facts:

After the orders of the General Directorate of Police announced that the headquarters of the PCR CC had moved to Râmnicu Vâlcea, followed by another order announcing the 3 patriotic action groups, a subsequent order even gave the name of the leader of the patriotic action in Oltenia (they said of the PCR CC in Oltenia) and with the conspiratorial name - Barbu - who has a son in Timișoara.

He was about to tell her his name and official pronoun. I was stunned. I suspected Himler and his comrades, who were dissatisfied that they were not included in the leadership of the county, etc., and in a few evenings, they had come to demand an accounting from me because they suspected that I was not a foreigner.

I denied it to them because they did not inspire confidence, and now the proof was coming.

They gave information but not definitive. **I completely confirm what Iandola stated in relation to this order as well as all the others, which he mentions in his statement. I do not dispute any of his statements regarding me.**

In my patriotic activity between 1940 and 1944-23rd August, and until August 1945 when I left for Iași, Iandola has his share of contribution as he states in his statement and as I show in the supplement for the time preceding 1945-and I only have gratitude for his support.

Witness Ioan (Iustinian) Marina

President Capt. of Justice Stănescu Sergiu

Popular Advisors Lt. Maj. Chiriță Ștefan and Lt. Constantinescu Gheorghe

Military Prosecutor Lt. Maj. Croitoru Vasile

Clerk Bălan Ștefan

Source: ACNSAS, P-137107 vol 1, ff. 568-574

Annex 2.

Bucharest Territorial Military Court

File 1079/1954

MINUTE STATEMENT

Drafted today, January 11th, 1955, by the panel of judges sent to the institution where Comrade Roșianu Mihail works

WITNESS DEPOSITION

Witness proposed by the accused **Iandola Serghie**

Witness's name and surname: **Mihail Roșianu**, age 54, domicile: Buc. str. Pictor Mirea no. 4, Stalin District, occupation Chairman of the Committee for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries,

...swearing according to the law, after being warned that if he did not tell the truth he would be guilty of the crime of perjury, made the following deposition reproduced in summary by the clerk:

Regarding the former head of security in the Râmnicu Vâlcea Police, I declare the following:

Before August 23, 1944, I did not personally know Iandola.

I knew him by sight as the head of security and I avoided him as I did with other people in the police apparatus, in order to manage to keep my conspiratorial activity and that of my comrades in the movement, from their eyes.

Only once in the spring of 1944, Iandola stopped me while I was passing through the Town Square of Râmnicu Vâlcea and asked me if priest Marina had communicated anything to me. I replied that he had not communicated anything to me. Then he told me that he was a close friend of Father Marina and that he would tell me about him. **He advised me to leave the city immediately and to be careful because I was being closely followed by the security people from Craiova.**

I asked him how he knew what I was doing and I told him that nothing of what he knew about communist activity in Vâlcea was true. He replied that I would find out more about him.

Indeed, priest Marina had told me that he had someone in the police who was doing services for the anti-fascist movement.

After August 23, priest Marina told me that Iandola was the man he had called on before August 23rd to get some people from Râmnicu Vâlcea out of custody and that he had also arranged the release of my son, who had been arrested in 1942 or 1943 for communist activity.

After August 23rd, 1944, Iandola came to me and told me everything he had done for the labor movement and the connections he had. I have not seen him since 1945.

I believe that Patriarch Justinian Marina can give you the most thorough information.

Source: ACNSAS P-137107 vol. 1, ff. 572-576.

Annex 3.

MINUTES

Drafted today, January 11th, 1955, by the panel of judges sent to the institution where Comrade Roșianu Ionel works

WITNESS DEPOSITION

Witness proposed by the accused **Iandola Serghie**

Witness's name and surname: **Ionel Roșianu**, age 29, domicile: Bucharest, 4 Pictor Mirea Street, Stalin District, occupation: **Professor of Marxism**,

... swearing according to the law, after being warned that if he did not tell the truth he would be guilty of the crime of perjury, made the following deposition reproduced in summary by the clerk:

I declare the following regarding the former security commissioner of the Râmnicu Vâlcea City Police:

In 1942 I was arrested by the security forces and accused of communist activity, together with other schoolmates, also UTC-ists (members of the Young Communist League).

For several days and nights, we were interrogated by Commissioner Andreescu, who tried to extract from us through terror statements regarding our activity and especially the connections we had with the communist party.

While we were being arrested and interrogated, I saw priest I. Marina, the current Patriarch, coming to security, together with Commissioner Iandola.

After a few days we were released and placed under surveillance.

Later, priest I. Marina informed me that our release was possible thanks to Commissioner Iandola, who facilitated tis.

Source: ACNSAS P-137107 vol. 1, fil 573,577

Annex 4.

INFORMATIVE NOTE

I have the honor to report to you that the legionary (sic!) thing is presented as follows:

The communists in the locality do not do propaganda in public... Propaganda and the transmission of orders they receive from the center are done by word of mouth from one to another. People who have trade businesses in Transnistria... do propaganda in favor of the communists by revealing... about the state of agriculture and fruit growing in Russia, superior to ours, etc. One of them is the pensioner Măldărescu, a former major platoon leader recently returned from Transnistria.

I have noticed that some of the communists or sympathizers of communism, who have little girls in primary school, dress them in red blouses and red bows on their heads.

From the conversation that two unknown people had in the presence of Mr. Curechianu, I remembered the following:

Among the prisoners in Russia, the Bolsheviks choose those who are capable of working, introduce them to the communist school and after training them, send them to the country for propaganda; thus, all the soldiers who declare to you that they escaped from the Bolshevik camps are among the agents trained by the Bolsheviks.

Resolution

To conduct a simultaneous home search with the participation of the Administrative and Judicial Bureaus of all those suspected of communism.

Check whether the suspected of communism dress their children with red blouses and red bows on their heads.

To supervise Mr. Măldărescu in order to ascertain whether, through the way he discusses in public, he is really creating an atmosphere favorable to Soviet Russia, which would target the laws in force, especially the provisions of ordinance no. 10/1943 of the C.I.A.

For the last note, a report will be made to the Inspectorate for future measures.

May 6th, 1943, Police Chief Emil Suflețel

The resolution of Commissioner Iandola Serghie follows, which distributes tasks to subordinates.

ACNSAS P-137107 vol 1, fil 489.

NOTE

I have the honor to report the following:

It is true that the said Măldărescu Dumitru from this city, with almost all the people he comes into contact with, discusses certain issues that he claims to have seen in Transnistria during his time there, showing the way of life of the Russian population, their organization and professional training, but he has not been heard to make propaganda of a communist nature.

In an article published by the aforementioned in the Pandurul Newspaper, which is printed in Drăgășani and has its editorial office in this city, he shows how women are also trained in Russia, thus saying that he was once in a car and on the way the engine broke down and not knowing the fault he looked for someone to get it moving but he could not find any man who could understand such things, and the residents recommended a woman who said she was good at mechanics.

In that article, he praised that woman, who, as soon as she got her hands on the engine, immediately saw the defect and in a short time the car was put into operation.

By this, the aforementioned wanted to show that in Russia, women were also well prepared to work in the garage, with skill also, so that at any moment they could replace the men.

Today he was supervised by me until 13:00, during which time he was seen in the entourage of Firescu, the market superintendent and a certain Nicu Rădulescu, who together entered Vasile Butta Fiu's pub at around 10 in the morning, where they consumed a few kg of wine and had a snack, I also sat at a table next to him, during which time they had various discussions but without any importance, however, the aforementioned also brought up some issues that he claims to have seen in Russia.

Speaking of some Russian men and women who speak Romanian perfectly, but he did not initiate any other conversations.

So far, we have not been able to determine whether the person mentioned is propagating or nurturing communist ideas through these discussions or is just curious about what he saw in Transnistria.

I will continue to monitor him and I will report any positive findings I make in this regard in a timely manner.

Police officer Gică Alexandru.

14.5.1943

ACNSAS P-137107 vol 1, tab 513

NOTE

I have the honor to report that from the investigations carried out discreetly among the suspects of communism in the locality, up to now no finding has been made whether they received from the communist headquarters Stalin's agenda addressed to the Russian people and the partisans behind the front on the occasion of May 3rd, 1943.

The investigations remain ongoing and if so, I will report the result in time.

Police Officer Gică Alexandru

19.05.1943,

ACNSAS P-137107 vol 1, tab 516

DEAR INSPECTOR

We have the honor to report that during the days of June 9th and 10th, 1943, we made home searches of the following suspected communist sympathizers noted below, with the observance of legal forms and the result was negative.

On June 9th, at Tufaru Ion, Ceapă Nicolae, Himler Iosif, Isvoranu Alexandru and Hin Ion.

On June 10th, 1943 at Stănculescu Mișu, Belu Gheorghe, Belu Ana, Diaconescu Anton, Văcaru Dumitru and Chirptop Petre.

Police Chief Constantin Dumitrescu and the Chief of the Security Bureau, Commissioner Iandola Serghie.

ACNSAS P-137107 vol 1, Tab 490

"DEAR CHIEF,

I have the honor to report that following the investigations made regarding the spread of a "pin" badge spread by communist elements, having a shiny yellow color and on which there is a button also of yellow color with a portrait of Stalin inside, it has not been spread to date and has not been seen on anyone's buttonhole. The investigations remain ongoing and any findings will be reported in a timely manner.

11.08.1943. Agent Popescu Constantin

ACNSAS P-137107 vol 1, tab 534

NOTE

In executing the order to carry out raids in the Gypsy Quarter and the Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters, I have the honor to report that I have had no cases except that the communists Himler Iosif, Sandu Ion and Bellu Gheorghe sitting alone at a table where they drank for two hours.

From the time they left until they arrived at their homes, they were constantly watched. There are fears that the named individuals are meeting at Himler Iosif's home this evening.

November 6, 1943 Police Agent Popescu Constantin
ACNSAS P-137107 vol 1 tab 536

DEAR INSPECTOR

In accordance with your order No. 1228 of May 11th, 1943, we have the honor to report to you that on the evening of June 5th, the first contact was made with Himler Iosif, a known communist.

He admits that he was the head of the sector of the Communist Organization in the city of Rm. Vâlcea and that he was excluded by the central leadership of the communist party 2 years ago; and he does not know the reason for the exclusion.

The named individual also stated that in Rm. Vâlcea there are only 4 communists, namely, besides him, there is also Mișu Stănculescu, Gheorghe Belu and Sandu Ion, who were also excluded from the communist central.

It was also possible to deduce from him that in Râmnicu Vâlcea, the central communist organization cannot have any success, since the workers sympathize with him to some extent and they did not understand that those at the central office should exploit the workers in Rm. Vâlcea, to create victims and fill the prisons with a few crazy people.

The person stated that there are no communist cells in Râmnicu Vâlcea; and if there is, there may be only one cell, which he does not know, but he suspects someone of being the head of the cell and hopes that he will identify him.

We will do everything possible to recruit him as an informant, although he is very cautious and skillful.

We will report any information we may obtain from the person in connection with the communist organization in time.

Police Chief Constantin Dumitrescu and Security Chief Commissioner
Iandola Serghe,

June 9th, 1944

ACNSAS P-137107 vol. 1, tab 488

Annex 5.

The account of Petrica Iliescu ("Nenea Petrișor", communist sympathizer-n.n.), a friend of Roșianu and Iandola.

"One morning I was talking to Roșianu behind the car in front of the drugstore in the market (in Râmnicu Vâlcea) and my boy was guarding the car, we were going to decide on which day to leave. Roșianu, who was facing the main street, jumped like a firecracker and said to me: "Look at that security guy, he's coming towards the car, I'm leaving, it's not a good thing to find us both". I stayed behind the car but Iandola, who was quickening his pace, noticed that Roșianu was moving away and started shouting after him: Mr. Roșianu, Mr. Roșianu, until Roșianu returned to the car. Commissioner Iandola greeted and asked: "Why are you running away from me, Mr. Roșianu?" We were silent and explained to him that the intention of avoiding him was far from us. He took me by one hand and Roșianu by the other and he told us, smiling: "Mr. Roșianu, I know all your activities, I know what you do and where you go. I haven't said anything to Nenea Petrișor until today, even though I go to his house and I was at his wedding. As long as there is Nenea Petrișor between you and me, don't be afraid of me because he has served me in a way I never expected. But I draw your attention, quite seriously, that from now on things are beyond me and the situation is as risky as can be. Eugen Cristescu has sent agents and special bodies for information and surveillance, agents to expose you, and we are afraid. We parted ways with him and were forced to reexamine the situation based on what we had been told. Commissioner Iandola, who, in addition to what we have shown above, kept Roșianu and Nache Simionescu hidden in his house for a whole night, since his wife, who had a small child, was also scared for she also knew that her husband was the head of the Security at that time.

Source:

Bogdan-Dumitru Aleca „*Evadarea lui Gheorghe Gheorghiu Dej din lagărul de la Târgu Jiu în mărturiile celor implicați*”, Muzeul județean “Aurelian Sacerdoțeanu” **Buridava** studii si materiale vol. XIII, Râmnicu Vâlcea 2018, fila 208.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Elis Neagoe, *Trecerea în rezervă a cadrelor M.A.I. între uz și abuz (1948 - 1965)* in Conf. univ. dr. Gheorghe Onișoru coord., *Totalitarism și rezistență, teroare și represiune în România comunistă*, București, 2001, pp. 62-65.
- [2]. Delia Cora, *Propaganda politică pentru și în timpul naționalizării comuniste*, in *Analele Banatului, Arheologie – Istorie*, vo. XXII, 2014, p. 476.

- [3]. Liviu Țăranu, *Problema cadrelor în M.A.I. (1948-1965)*, in Gheorghe Onișoru, coord., *Totalitarism și rezistență, teroare și represiune în România*, București, 2001, pp. 28-40.
- [4]. Nicoleta Ionescu-Gură, *Stalinizarea României. Republica Populară Română 1948 – 1950: transformări instituționale*, București (2005), p. 27.
- [5]. Cristina Roman, *Bazele legislative ale represiunii comuniste în România*, în **Anuarul IICCR** p. 66, online https://anuar.iicmer.ro/wpcontent/uploads/2022/11/Anuar_Voll_CristinaRoman_65_82.pdf, accessed July 10, 2025.
- [6]. Valentin-Stelian Bădescu, Liviu Done, *Unele considerații privind dreptul penal românesc în perioada regimului comunist. Tranziția postcomunistă și reconstrucția justiției române. Poziții actuale privind identitatea națională și procesul integrării europene*, Partea a II-a, in **Acta Universitatis George Bacovia. Juridica**, vol. 8, Issue 2/2019, online https://www.ugb.ro/Juridica/Issue16ROEN/1_Dreptul_penal_romanesc_in_perioada_regimului_comunist.Parte_a_II.Badescu.RO.pdf accessed July 10, 2025.
- [7]. Iuliu Crăcană, *Drept și Justiție în România comunistă (III). Un conflict între două instituții represive - Securitatea și Procuratura*, in **Caietele CNSAS** Revistă semestrială editată de Consiliul Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității, Anul VI, nr. 1-2(11-12)/2013,
- [8]. Romulus Rusan, *Cronologia și geografia represiunii. Recensământul populației concentraționale din România (1945-1989)*, Fundația Academia Civică, 2007, online <https://www.memorialsighet.ro/romulus-rusan-cronologia-i-geografia-represiunii-recensmantul-populaiei-concentraionare-din-romania-1945-1989-3/> accessed July 10, 2025.
- [9]. Arhiva Consiliului Național pentru Studierea Arhivelor Securității, fond P-137107, vol. 7, f. 55. În continuare se va cita ACNSAS, fond, vol., f.
- [10]. Ion Măldărescu, *80 de ani de la „Atentat la Mareșal”*, in **Art-Emis.ro**, 28 Iulie 2024, online <https://www.art-emis.ro/istorie/80-de-ani-de-la-atentat-la-maresal> accessed July 10, 2025
- [11]. Serghe Iandola, *Memoriile fostului șef al Siguranței vâlcene*, în **Curierul de Vâlcea** nr. 968 din 13-14 nov.1993.
- [12]. Sorin Oane, *Istoria comunismului vâlcean până la 23 august 1944*, in **Buridava**. Studii și materiale, vol. XI, Râmnicu Vâlcea, 2013-2014, p. 243.
- [13]. Bartolomeu Anania, *Amintiri despre Patriarhul Iustinian*, in **Revista BOR**, nr. 3/2017, pp. 363-389, <https://www.revistabor.ro/wp-content/uploads/restituiri-amintiri-despre-P-Justinian.pdf> . accessed July 9, 2025
- [14]. Dragoș Ursu, *Patriarhul Justinian (1948-1977) și reintegrarea socioprofesională a clericilor, foști deținuți politici. Strategii, compromisuri și adaptări*, in **Terra Sebus**. Acta Musei Sabesiensis, vol. 11, 2019, p. 492.