

Babeş-Bolyai University Cluj-Napoca

Faculty of History and Philosophy

DOCTORAL THESIS

**The Apuseni Mountains Anticommunist
Armed Resistance Movement in the
Collective Memory
(1948-1958)**

Scientific coordinator:

Prof. dr. Doru Radosav

PhD Candidate:

Paula-Vasilica Ivan

Cluj-Napoca

2011

Key words: Anticommunist armed resistance movements, collective memory, history of communism, repression

Contents:

Introductory word

Chapter 1 – General considerations

I.1 Methodological benchmarks. Collective memory, memorialization and places of memory. The case study approach

I.2 Historiographical benchmarks

I.3 Aspects of the anticommunist resistance movement in Central and Eastern Europe

I.4 Considerations on oral history

Chapter 2 Anticommunist resistance movement in archival and oral history sources

II.1 General framework

II.2 Anticommunist resistance movements in Apuseni Mountains area

II.2.1 The anticommunist resistance movement „Calul Bălan”

II. 2.2 The anticommunist resistance movement „Partizanii Regelui Mihai – Armata Secretă. Garda Albă” (King’s Michael partisans – Secret Army – White Guard)

II. 2.3 The anticommunist resistance movement „Podea Alexandru”

II. 2. 4 The anticommunist resistance movement „Pușcaș Dumitru”

II. 2. The anticommunist resistance movement „Spaniol Vasile”

II. 2.6 The anticommunist resistance movement „Stupineanu – Cățineanu”

II. 2. 7 The anticommunist resistance movement „Leon Șușman”

II. 2.8 The anticommunist resistance movement „Deac Cornel”

II. 2.9 The anticommunist resistance movement „Echipa Cruce și Spadă” (Cross and sword team)

II. 2. 10 The anticommunist resistance movement „Dabija Gheorghe”

II. 2. 11 The anticommunist resistance movement „Șușman Teodor”

II. 2.12 Teodor Șușman „judged in Răchițele” or memory as justice

II. 3 Motivations of the anticommunist resistance movement

Chapter III Formes of repression of the anticommunist resistance movement in the collective memory

- III.1 The informative network
- III. 2 The arrest, the investigation and the trial
- III. 3 Executions of partisans
- III. 4 The detention
- III. 5 The repression against the families
- III. 6 After the release
- III. 7 After the Revolution in 1989

Chapter IV Myths and symbols regarding the anticommunist resistance in the collective memory

- IV. 1. Hero partisan
- IV. 2 „Americans coming”
- IV. 3 The mountain and the forest

Conclusion

Bibliography

Sources

Books and articles

Annexes

List of annexed documents

This paper comprises four chapters – introduction, conclusions, bibliography and annexes. Chapter one - “General considerations” – develops an approach of the 1948-1958 Apuseni Mountains anticommunist armed resistance in the collective memory, as well as of core historiographical landmarks on which this thesis is based, of the resistance phenomenon’s framework within the central and Eastern European context and marks several assessments on oral history.

The Second Chapter, “Anticommunist Resistance Groups in the Apuseni Mountains in archival and oral history sources” comprises a brief presentation of the armed resistance phenomenon and of means for researching it, of its attributes and limitations, a presentation of the resistance groups (the 12 ones) and, in the end, of several conclusions in reference to the motives of the resistance.

The Third Chapter, “Repression means for the Anticommunist Resistance in Collective Memory” stresses the means of repressions of the anticommunist resistance in the collective memory, with a case study on the groups in the Huedin area: “Șuşman Teodor”, „Capotă-Dejeu” and „Cruce și Spadă”, based on the documents from the Institute of Oral History of the Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj Napoca.

The Fourth Chapter, “Myths and Symbols in the Collective Memory of the Anticommunist Resistance” propounds an analysis similar to the one in the previous chapter of the myths and symbols connected to the referred to phenomenon, with their representation in collective memory.

The “Conclusions” present these papers’ coordinates and synthesize several aspects which define the armed resistance movement in the Apuseni Mountains by typology, motivation, action and repression.

The Annexes are structured as a catalog with copies of the most significant documents referring to this topic found at the Cluj County Bureau of the National Archives and the National Council for the Securitate Archives.

This paper is based on collective memory concepts, on memorialization and places of memory, but builds its own approach, as the object of its research – the resistance in the

mountains in the first stage of communism – is referred essentially to a memory of trauma.¹ On the other hand, it states the recent character of this memory's occurrence – after the 1990s it has an ambiguous status. If papers signed by historians as Pierre Nora² or Benedict Anderson³ are documenting a memory of a trauma that transformed in heroism, to which an imaginary community is referring to in an axiological manner, the memory this paper presents, the one of the anticommunist resistance in the mountains, is far from being heroic in a post-communist present with a secondary or far too political remembrance. This memory of anticommunist resistance is revealed after many decades since the events, thus it could be thought of as an adjourned memory.

Moreover, this memory caught in oral confessions of the few participants that survived the events or of their successors is opposed to the official memory, the one documented by the communist regime. These two memories are conflicting and the most significant symbol of this argument is, perhaps, the way the two are portraying resistants: whilst the collective memory has a tendency to present them as heroes, the official memory labels them as bandits.

The case study is structured by groups of resistance, whose activity is documented through two categories of sources: archives and oral history. We preferred this approach because research on resistance movements in the Apuseni Mountains is in its early stages and researchers have so far looked into larger groups, active on more extended periods of time. Thereby the “Teodor Șușman” group can almost undoubtedly be considered the group with the most extended function, but also the one whose activity raised many controversies among historians and remains a turning point for the community of Răchișele, the village where it originated. This is why it has been extensively researched, unlike other groups as “Alexandru Podea” or “Spaniol Vasile”, whose activity came to an end in 1952-1953, when it has been discovered and annihilated by the Securitate.

Of course, certain selectivity may be identified when researchers are presenting these groups, for many understandable reasons. But as this paper is a monography of the resistance movements in the Apuseni Mountains, it presents all the documented groups. A special attention

¹ Dominick LaCapra, *Writing History, Writing Trauma*, John Hopkins University Press, 2001.

² Pierre Nora, ed. *Les Lieux de mémoire*, (seven volumes), Paris, Edition Gallimard, 1984–1992.

³ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, New York, Verso, 1991.

is particularly granted to smaller groups operative for shorter periods of time, in order to broaden the historian research spectrum referring to the anticommunist resistance in the Apuseni area.

This paper's objectives and structure were influenced by the deliberate acceptance of the fragmented and local character of the anticommunist resistance, and this methodological caution may be easily understood in the context of a still incomplete picture of the resistance in the Apuseni Mountains. The groups are presented monographically, according to a set of criteria designed to standardize the fragmentary nature of the information provided by the archival and oral history sources. These criteria are:

1. group members (name, address, date of birth, nationality, education, occupation, wealth, marital status, family, political party activity, political affiliation);
2. activity in the mountains (motivation of resistance, methods of organization, strategies, areas of activity, links with other groups, relations with the authorities, relations with the villagers, the group's daily life, building shelters, relationships among group members, exceptional moments of life, leaders, criteria and methods of their appointment as leaders);
3. consequences of resistance participation on individual and family evolution (period of detention, persecution of family, life after release from prison, views on the communist regime, relations with the authorities and the community).

The main hypothesis of research qualitatively explored by this paper refers to the validity of the concept of armed resistance in the Apuseni Mountains. The concept has been used both in everyday language and in historiography for two reasons: on the one hand, because the partisans were mainly armed with weapons they had acquired during the war and, on the other, because the collective memory referred to forms of resistance against communism was investigated immediately after 1990, mainly by a media less focused on concepts and more on events. After having investigated archival and oral sources, the paper concludes that using the concept of armed resistance for all groups except for those run by people of armed structures of the interwar period (group "Dejeu" or "Cruce și Spadă", for example) is exaggerated, and also becomes an impediment in formulating an accurate definition of the character of these groups. It must be taken into account the fact that most partisans had a non-combat philosophy for their relationship with authorities and refused to use weapons, unless it was absolutely necessary.

The paper is structured in five chapters. The introduction proposes a discussion of the methodological and historiographical framework. The second chapter, the most substantial of the ones in this paper, presents in great detail the sources and is organized on discussions about resistance groups reported by the 27th Miliția Region of Cluj, whose archives were primarily used for this research. Chapters III and IV analyze the documentary information provided in Chapter II, around two themes: the forms of repression imposed on resisters, relatives, support elements and communities from which they came (Chapter III) and myths and symbols of resistance. If Chapter III primarily explores what American historian Dominick LaCapra called *memory of trauma*, Chapter IV explores in depth the research hypothesis, analyzing how the concept of armed resistance has developed in the collective memory and to what extent it is appropriate. Chapter V contains the conclusions, which call for a general discussion on this research compared to previous historiography and lists the main results of the work.

This paper uses qualitative methods, of which are worth mentioning the documentary analysis (for archival sources) and the interviews (as means of in depth exploration of the collective memory). Information from the two types of sources is synthesized and analyzed in chapter II, in order to get an overview of the Apuseni Mountains resistance groups, while in Chapters III and IV it is filtered through two criteria: forms of repression and resistance-related myths and symbols.

The structure of the second part of the paper refers to the forms of repression in the collective memory and the myths and symbols of resistance. The research is based on documentary material from the Archive of the Institute of Oral History at the "Babeş-Bolyai" University of Cluj-Napoca. For the two chapters we extensively used interviews of witnesses from the three groups in the Huedin area "Şuşman Teodor", "Cruce şi Spadă" and "Capotă-Dejeu", as the general framework is the same for all resistance groups.

Officially, the issue of anti-resistance in Romania remained a "restrained" topic by December 1989 and was only tangentially and in a completely distorted manner reported by the communist historiography. The collective memory of this topic was also "restrained" for perpetuating the image of a flawless system, which never fails. It is clear that resistance was considered a "flaw" of the system and silently assumed as a party and state power weakness. It was to be expected that in such a context the approach of the academic literature (in the few

cases where it was not completely overlooked) was ideologically marked by the official discourse on the "reactionary elements" of the "enemies of the people" and of the foreign imperialist forces. Ideological literature (especially in a self-declared society of rule of law) marked conflicts as having a secondary affiliation, a political one. The administration and the public institutions – being the main distributors of scientific and historian documentation –tended to depreciate and minimize any act of opposition or protest that threatened to diminish the prestige of a society which wished to be perfect. This officially established a "specialized" terminology (also assumed by researchers), which describes the anticommunist resistance movement as "subversive acts and undermining of social order"; the armed anticommunist resistance groups were collectively named "gangs" – especially in the documents issued by the Police and the Securitate - and anticommunist fighters were "complimented" with a wide range of epithets: bandits, runaways, hostile elements, enemies of the people, reactionary elements etc.

After methodological clarifications specific to each beginning, historical research understood that analyzing the communist period can not be achieved in all its complexity without a complementary approach of the sources, both documentary and of oral history. One can already speak about a coherent and systematic discourse, marked by archive and memory, drawing the guidelines of the "new history" which claims its exemplary social and ethical size.

Our approach subscribes to this line and presents the Apuseni Mountains anticommunist armed resistance movement in the collective memory for the years 1948-1958, based on archival documentary sources from the Cluj County Bureau of the National Archives, the Military Court Cluj, the National Council for the Securitate Archives, on documentary material from the Archive of the Institute of Oral History at the "Babeş-Bolyai" University, Cluj Napoca, as well as on archive of testimonies from the author's personal collection, consisting of interviews with members of resistance groups, cooperators and followers and the participants' descendants to the events of that period.

Archival documents have the advantage of not being influenced by subsequent events, but may be inadequate or incomplete, bearing their creator's implicit stamp. The documents from public institutions are always subject to specific schemes and typologies that deplete the human message, giving stronger quantitative information and data related to events. On the other hand, oral history places the researcher in the proximity of the subject matter, with the source of the

memory embodied in confessions through interviews, a specific quantitative methodological approach.

In the case of the Apuseni Mountains anticommunist resistance movement there is an extremely rich archival material, with numerous references to resistance groups in the area, known as "gangs", but in terms of quality of the information it could be imposed the fact that candidates were disparate, repetitive, subjective and ideologically marked by the official discourse.

The perspective on the armed resistance phenomenon would be incomplete without the call to memory, because the phenomena of clandestinity are an accepted territory in history, when the oral source replaces or adds to a written document. This becomes the alternative for revealing the actors of a long forgotten, marginalized or forbidden play.

From the perspective of complementary use of documentation sources, we tried to retrace the appearance, evolution and ending of the most important anticommunist resistance groups in the Apuseni Mountains, reported by the Region 27 of the Cluj Milișia and by the field investigations lead by the Institute of Oral History, whose following oral history archive we consulted. Some of these groups have benefitted from historiographical means of research, which resulted in interview collections accompanied by introductory studies (the "Teodor Șușman" Group, "Capotă-Dejeu" and partly "Cruce și Spadă"), others were reported only in the general framework of the phenomenon (the "Garda Albă. Partizanii Majestății Sale Regele Mihai" Group, "Podea Alexandru și Dabija", "Șușman Leon", "Spaniol Vasile"), and others were not documented at all (the "Calul Bălan" Group, "Pușcaș Dumitru", "Stupineanu-Cățineanu", "Deac Cornel", "Pop Vasile"). As part of the paper, we also explored the perception on the anticommunist armed resistance on the collective mental, granting special attention to the repression means and to the myths and symbols in the collective memory and to several controversial aspects which mark even today the community's existence and view upon recent happenings.

Firstly, we argued whether we could talk about a national movement of armed anticommunist resistance in this area (the Cluj Region, Alba, Bistrița, Mureș).

There is a tendency that all retreat acts of people from the community which determined a response from the repressive authorities are considered an anticommunist armed resistance and most of the fugitives are labeled as partisans, but this matter implies some tinting in order to achieve proper clarifications.

There is not proof that in Romania the armed resistance united under a single leadership to assume its activity logistically and tactically. We can only identify several attempts of regional unity – as the ones in the Apuseni Mountains, where the anticommunist paramilitary organizations tried to extend multiple cores in the area. In this case, it is worth mentioning the “Garda Albă. Partizanii Majestății Sale Regele Mihai” Group, which managed to notably extend its activity, but being insufficiently prepared tactically and logistically, it was annihilated before it managed to coordinate a real action.

Except for the de resistance groups lead by militaries, as the “Dabija” Group or the “Cruce și Spadă” Group, the others were lead and composed mainly of people with no connections to military training or discipline. They lacked a clear vision and, driven by civic courage and the instinct of protecting their own lives, they found themselves unable to lead and support an act of substance. This is why they only appealed to typical outlaw means: random strikes for getting food at local stores in isolated villages, building shelters in less accessible areas, cutting phone lines to harden communications between state authorities, attacking cereal storage areas as a protest against the burdening system of quotas etc.

As in the outlaws’ folklore, the leaders of these groups were often hunted both by the law enforcement authorities, and the ones who were willing to cooperate, and they were sometimes forced to confront them when arrests were being planned.

Another reality specific to the area subject to this paper is the absence of a territorial control. There could not be organized an active presence of the armed formations of the resistance in this territory by covering a geographical area large enough to determine actions of relevant and major protests able to shake the system from within. Aside from actions of anticommunist and anti-Soviet instigation or actions of physical violence on members of the PCR (Romanian Communist Party), on rangers, brigadiers and other employees of the party and the state, the means for imposing a control in the region were extremely low, almost absent. In

the absence of an internal armed conflict, properly acknowledged and accepted in war practice, with assumed roles, the executions of certain people, proven to or suspected of cooperation with the Securitate (the case of the “Șușman Teodor” and „Șușman Leon” groups) can only be considered murders and be judged by the international law as crimes against humanity. These groups are more than armed groups to develop military actions specific to an operational scene, they can be categorized for the most part as bands of opportunity built on common general premises.

Because all the runaway anticommunist resistants were equipped with at least a weapon and ammunition, some authors rushed to label the phenomenon as an armed resistance and used this as an argument. In fact, for many times this is confused with civic disobedience, because the weapons were primarily used for intimidation and self defense and less for armed operations against the regime. For the researched groups there have not been reported any cases of organized attacks against repressive and armed state forces, unless they were sporadic responses to surprise attempts to arrest the ones being followed.

An attribute of the evolution of the resistance movement of the “bands” was the absence of a real and lasting influence on the population. It is worth mentioning that in the situations where the runaway groups enjoyed community support they operated for longer periods of time because the law enforcement forces could hardly place an efficient informational network on the field (examples of such groups are „Șușman Leon”, „Constantin Deac” or “Șușman Teodor”). For the other cases, authorities succeeded to annihilate all the resistance formations reported in the Cluj-Alba Region in a relatively short term, from 2 to 3 years. Initially, the “movement” enjoyed direct and indirect support from the population, among which acted most of its followers. They were constituted by political affiliation, by families, or by opportunity generated by several constraints. As time passed and pressures on local communities by the Miliție and the Securitate increased, things began to change and support and trust capital decreased. The attachment of the ones who stayed home towards the ones who decided to become “outlaws” was strongly connected to how much the population was willing to undertake the dangers and the deprivations imposed by the regime. Because there was not a united and defined political guideline and a clear finality to compensate the deprivations, the communities’ morale decreased and in the end they gave up fighting against the system. All the actions meant to annihilate the

resistance groups were anticipated by the retreat of the ones who originally supported them. The “bandits” in the mountains named themselves outlaws or partisans with their defensive attitude, but they did not succeed in overcoming their “runaway” condition and damaged their image in the eyes of the population. This explains the fact that on a collective mental level there has been kept a certain view on these groups often criticizing, which accused their Romanticism of unconsciousness and their aspirations as lacking a real basis.

By structure, reasons of appearance, activity, aspirations, relations with the population and duration of activity, we can pin several types of resistance groups.

- Those who, ever since their establishment, aim for an armed resistance as a primary goal, led by demobilized officers who, by training and formation, had the ability to start a fight against occupation troops, as well as against repression troops of domestic administration (Major Gheorghe Dabija and Captain Gheorghe Gheorghiu). They foresaw the transition to attacking the party headquarters, to killing local communist leaders, to acts of sabotage on strategic points in communication and transport systems to trigger a favorable land, open to armed insurrection. They fought, and some have managed to create a vast network of members with broad territorial coverage, developing a political program and inspiring the locals with a hostile attitude towards the regime in power and with faith that, with support from the Anglo-Americans, they will be able to release the country from Soviet influence. After an assessment of the danger these groups represented, the authorities have set in motion the whole mechanism of repression, acting forcefully and without hesitation to annihilate them. This action had the expected outcome, both groups being dismantled after a short period of activity in 1949 and 1950. Leaders of the two groups did not join the anticommunist resistance movement driven by opportunity related to imminent arrest or attempting to escape arrest from previous convictions, but by the belief that, by organizing an armed fight against the regime, it could be overturned. Sometimes naively (as an objective assessment of the domestic and international situation), these officers were driven by patriotism, courage and, in the end, they realized the real state of mind of sacrifice.

- Another category is primarily characterized by action of civil disobedience, manifested by the phenomenon of escape in the mountains as an immediate response to the oppressive political regime shown to all social ranks and mainly to the rural communities who immediately felt the burden of quotas and of property seizures.

For the Apuseni Mountains, as a special characteristic, there should be mentioned the fact that the *moti people* were deprived of the possibility of woodworking, the main occupation in the area, as well as of the right of innkeeping. These two acts struck in a traditional society severely and generated a very articulated response (Group "Teodor Şuşman").

Participants to this form of resistance were grouped by opportunity and individual motivations were determined, although we can not deny the general reasons related to anticommunist and anti-Soviet feelings. The main activity of these "subversive" organizations was connected to survival, without having a clear view, at least in theory, of what would happen until the "coming of the Americans" and the outbreak of a war between the East and the West. Even if attacks were launched on public targets, the immediate motivation was mostly to purchase food or money to survive. The general attitude was one of *non combat* and clashes with authorities had, almost without exception, an air of self defense.

- There were also groups that were created to function as centers of resistance in case of international conflict and to build and administrate warehouses for weaponry that would support a possible internal military response in an external conflict ("Garda Albă" and Group "Leon Şuşman").

Although, at least in the beginning, it received the important advantages of favorable natural conditions, and also broad support of the society, especially the rural one which was driven by strong anti-Soviet feelings, anti-communist resistance was quickly defeated. In our case, except for two notable exceptions - Group "Şuşman Teodor" and "Leon Şuşman" - all other groups were annihilated in the first two or three years from their reporting. We do not exclude the possibility that repression could be achieved much faster if there was no serious damage in the activity of repressive apparatus, which required ongoing fixes.

All resistance groups being described in the present research have settled and worked in mountainous, wooded, and hard to reach, close to the community where their family members were. The area was unable to accommodate informational and operational groups, but it provided a perfect life underground and a redoubtable weapon against those sent to restore "order", thus the configuration space can be a geographical explanation for the large number of "gangs" reported in the area, but also for the difficulties encountered by the Police and the Securitate in

their liquidation. The frequently relief "hostile" was mentioned in official reports to justify, rightly poor results in the tracking activity.

The political color of the members of the resistance movement was mostly (especially for leaders) of National Peasant's Party or Legionnaires, although we have a valid exception in the case of Teodor Şuşman, who was known as Liberal leader. The phenomenon is understandable, considering the fact that the NPP was very popular in Transylvania and benefited from a strong sympathy and a significant capital of image. To this popularity an essential contribution was brought forward by its leader Iuliu Maniu, to the events related to the Great Union of 1918. The Legion has gained ground, especially at the end of the interwar period, winning many followers and being represented in all areas, with a strong center in Alba at Aiud. On the other hand, it must be clear that many ordinary members of the resistance movement was apolitical, which leads to the conclusion that the political leaders would not have been decisive in deciding the opposition to the regime, but it is clear that the membership expressed a set of democratic values, crushed by Soviet boot relentlessly favored the anti-clotting revolt. In fact, most leaders have ran from home and became fugitives fearing they would be detained by the Securitate since the wave of arrests began, in March 1947, for members of democratic political parties and in May 1948, for the Legionnaires. Observed and followed for their political activity, but also because of the obvious hostility that manifested though deprivation of property and prevention from developing business or forced to run away from earlier convictions, they take advantage of poorly consolidated law enforcement and run in the mountains. There have been cases when escaping from home was done preventively, in order to escape a potential arrest. In this little fact lies the immediate resistance motivation.

These leaders were able to gather people around them, primarily very close family members, friends and acquaintances that, for one reason or another, were in the same situation. Basically, most group members were forced to choose between running away from home and detention.

In addition to these individual motivations and circumstances, we can detect in the collective mind a strong anti-Soviet sense, which doubled the immediate causes and was always fed, long after the fall of the last "partisan".

The actions of these armed groups were not on a large scale and did not directly target the political regime; they were mainly aimed at self-defence and survival, until the outbreak of armed conflict between the USSR and democratic forces "coming Americans" rescuers. This level of expectation rests a more than naive and a rather Romantic than heroic, in line with reality. Leaders could not assume the role of coordinating real military movements; they are satisfied reactions are spontaneous and sporadic, often wearing the form of anti-propaganda. The explanation for the definition of this resistance, the collective memory that armed resistance is related to the fact that, under the impact of war still alive, the gun bearer of the status of a soldier, community transfer this perception to armed fugitives, quartered in the mountains and forests (which formed the army of good, always follow the repressive forces). The collective mental transferred image to the war recently ended, internally without the proportions, the other belligerents, but essentially resulted in the struggle between good and evil and in a dramatic end.

The institutions responsible for the suppression of resistance in the Apuseni Mountains were not very clearly mentioned in the individual collective memory. Communists and repressive forces of the Militia, Securitate and Prosecutor were mixed in an unity of evil, set in contrast with the image always advocated freedom fighter.

Joining-communist partisan witness or witnesses to events reveals a quality report, advocated the popular hero, good strength, while the Communist exponent negative characteristics, brain and tool of repression.

Although the perception of collective repression is linked to Militia and Securitate, we can sense the presence of guardianship of the Communist Party. Although it attempts to maintain "discretion" of this phenomenon and documentary material came from party bodies is the poorest in the anticommunist resistance is "disclosed" by the actions of collective memory recovery "arrested" which places it as charge establishment of the state's main terror. Militia and Securitate image as instruments of repression and their method of liquidation proceedings against any form of opposition to the regime were more well defined in the collective mind. Although perceptions of the two institutions overlaps down to the confusion, most of them are remembering the suffering and brutal of the direct impact that it had with civil society.

Reconstruction of "anticommunist armed resistance" implies own methods of repression, highlighted by the recovery of memory: information network (by infiltration of informers and their recruitment of relatives of resistance groups, through various means, from working freely to blackmail or physical aggression, spying, etc.), operational actions (regarding the movement of troops on the ground in direct action to capture or annihilation of the fugitives), individual and collective arrests, investigation, trials, executions of partisans, detention, repression against the families and the treatment they were subject to the prison after release from prisons and labor camps.

These methods deeply stigmatized communities involved, resembling fear among the population that will govern even after the 1989 founding human emotions. Fear will be the main ally of the regime and guard "silence" unofficial memory.

The testimonies of the survivors made contemporary Romanian society after 1989 have the opportunity to "recover" from the past, "restrained" by a totalitarian state, so a moral victory was undertaken by the victims of perpetrators by removing the dark truth. We are in a position to get acquainted with the horrors of totalitarianism through memory Romanian, but also the collective imagination sediment profile during this period and its production: myths, symbols, feelings of anxiety and silence.

In periods characterized by seizures, the production of myths became active when both in power and in assaulted the community, enhances mitogeneza: power to impose and legitimize, and the community to defend itself from attack power. Official testimony of communist rule, mostly "imported" from the USSR and proved their "effectiveness" (the myth of progress provided by the working class, the myth of Soviet liberators, the myth of peace, welfare, the liberator, the peacekeepers) were erected alongside the destruction of democracy and the whole system of values that it will represent.

Specific for this period was the confrontation between myth and counter-myths – official myths supported by a major propaganda effort opposing them the corresponding contramiturile. Thus, for example, the official myth of the West "rotten" underground contramitul opposed a strong West, idealized, only able to support real fall of communism.

The approach of polling the collective imagination, we can analyze the situation of armed resistance to anti-development not only events but also the sensitivities, expectations and drama of the sum involved.

In the collective mind, attacked the new political rivals, who left the mountains to fight to defend the country from the danger Bolshevik heroes have become saviors attributes, the most powerful vision with a group of resistance leaders portrayed as heroes in modern interviews with witnesses and exemplary models. The process of making "supporters" herous should be analyzed in terms of the other, the qualities of the hero being directly proportional to the defects of Communists. Partisan is the term welfare, while communist and its tools are an expression of evil.

The hero is surrounded by symbols, or has generated very anti-military movement gaining strength in the face of the symbol meanings of good and evil. Also a symbolic way and places where rezistenții withdrew "mountain" or "the woods", but also objects and words translated into loyalty oath to support the cause.

Another myth was established, that of the "coming of Americans", strongly represented in the collective mind, born as a form of protection of society in the multiple assaults of the new powers. It is positioned as a response to the official myth - "Soviet liberators," but rather a pretext for a decision already taken, but a decisive argument for anti-motivation and withdrawal resistance in the mountains. He favored the decision to assume the condition of fighting against the regime, but not essentially caused it.

Addressing issues related to myths and symbols in the "armed" anticommunist resistance movement using productions offered by the witness, it is necessary to keep us far from the danger of transferring them in historiography, but also to understand the human dimension of a phenomenon that dramatically shaken Romanian society and whose consequences are felt to this day.