

1. Guard ...

9m-9

From "Vestitorul" (Salzburg, Austria), October-November, 1951.

Denunciations and Denouncers.

The denunciation made last summer against Mr. Malaxa by Messrs. Visoianu and Cretzianu is more than just the most resounding case that is part of a continuous activity of denunciations, which, unfortunately, is not limited to the group surrounding the National Committee. It is the result of a morbid state of impotence and fear.

There are men who have been raised to or have assumed various functions of leadership on divers levels, or who aspire to them, without having however the authority such functions involve. Such authority stems from some previous stand and from a creative political activity, and it is absent. And paralyzed action makes insecure any foundation for posts of authority, and generates the fear that the situation cannot endure, that the political vacuum cannot remain permanent. In the absence of positive qualifications or activities that might be opposed to competitors, the only remaining means is the attempt to paralyze all other activity. To those who are trying to save their own lives all means are legitimate, and even a crime becomes self-defense under such circumstances. And there are many who are fighting for their political existence. But their political agony is not due to any outside intervention, but to an inner decomposition, to the inability to cope with the tasks imposed by the times and circumstances in which we are living.

So it is not surprising that verbal indignations, even developed in newspaper articles, against the ignominies we are constantly faced with, have no effect whatever. All the more so as hypocritical indignation takes its place alongside the sincere sort. All too often we discover, under the faultlessly pure verbal garments, but the satisfaction of seeing a competitor placed in such an unfavorable light, that of finding him revealed as inadequate, not able to conceal his hand.

It is thus that, in the discussion arisen in connection with the denunciation made against Mr. Malaxa, the thing that has come to the fore is the ridiculous situation of Messrs. Visoianu and Cretzianu, who were required to state their own financial resources, so that everyone could take note how little still remains of the famous Swiss funds. (These funds, become the bone of contention, led to the ~~disruption~~ disruption of the former National Committee, and form to this day the sole preoccupation, the

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCES METHODS EXEMPTION 3B2B  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2004 2008

sole subject of discussion among those who would wish to call themselves Rumanian statesmen. When these funds are entirely eaten up, it may well be that the entire Rumanian political activity in exile will stop - for want of an object.)

Hypocrisy, like the suspicion of hypocrisy, as well as the petty level of our concerns, leave moral arguments completely deprived of all efficacy. Particularly as we exiles are too few, each with his own well crystallized positions and interests, and lacking a sufficiently large floating mass that might give consistency to currents of opinion. And we expect the solutions to our problems too much from outside, to take into account what each of us might think.

All dishonorable acts carry moral stigmata, whether or not these are felt here and now. Obligations of individual dignity, of national solidarity, of mutual respect, must be recalled even to those who might feel such obligations do not concern them. Even if it be only to remind them that their temporary abeyance is definitely accepted. We hope some fine day the general level of our preoccupations will be raised, and this hope should not be abandoned.

But the problem of denunciations, which has become a veritable plague, has other aspects too. ~~When~~<sup>Though</sup> denunciations are used to eliminate competitors, they may sometimes have sincere motives or motives apt to defend us against infiltration by communist agents, with an obligation of loyalty toward the countries that grant us asylum. Let us imagine for a moment that Messrs. Visoianu and Gretsianu put themselves the following problem: Mr. Malaxa has succeeded in making a position for himself in America, and he supports the Radescu group. Both these things should please us as Rumanians, even though Mr. Malaxa personally might not be liked, and General Radescu might be an adversary. But there are indications or suspicions that he maintains or might maintain a collaboration with the communists. (That these indications or suspicions are not serious is proven by the fact that his residence permit was renewed. And the case with which the Committee accepted the possibility in principle of a collaboration with the communist regime, were it not a hypocritical pretext, would constitute an indication that we are loath to formulate. If Mr. Visoianu's past pro-Soviet attitude is not proven, there is no element that might permit us to believe that the various acts of the Committee serve otherwise than coincidentally the purposes of the communist

[ ]

regime: paralyzing and disrupting the emigration. It is not Mr. Visolani's present conversion to anti-Sovietism that we put in doubt, but his capacity of making this attitude bear fruit.) In other words, the conflict would have been as follows: Rumanian interests would have required that Mr. Malaxa (like, indeed, any other Rumanian) remain in the United States, but loyalty to the country that gave the hospitality required that he be unmasked. And this conflict, too, might oppose two loyalties and could very well occur or be invoked in other cases as well.

But if it is legitimate for each country to defend its security and hence to keep informed of any activities of those benefiting from its hospitality that might affect that security, such information is carried out by the usual services. Assuredly, too, with the assistance of agents from among the persons having access to the respective circles - in this case, the Rumanians. So long as the latter carry out their service correctly, their activity is legitimate and it does not hamper us, because our problems have no contact with the lives of the countries that give us asylum, but are directed toward combating communism. But our obligation of loyalty toward these countries cannot be greater than that incumbent to their own nationals. This concerns the denunciation of common-law criminals and of offences that affect the security and the public order of the state. The fight we are waging against communism is not covered by the laws that defend the security of the state. Only our persons and liberties are defended, only they are under the protection of the laws of any country that defend the individual. More brutally said, the police of the country in which we live will not intervene unless the assassination or kidnapping of one of us be attempted, or if it be a matter of some activity that endangers the security of the respective state. Such things constitute but exceptional/~~missions~~<sup>missions</sup> of communist agents. Usually, they (the missions) are directed at informing and creating diversions among the emigration. That is to say, describing ~~xxx~~ persons, with their individual faults and qualities, in order to establish how dangerous each of us is and to identify activities, so that the thread that connects us with those at home may be reached. Diversionism tends toward paralyzing actions: through denunciations, slander, misunderstandings.

Against such activities, the police does not protect us. The denunciation of the agents that carry them out does not take them out of ~~xx~~ circulation, because such

activities are not punishable, they merely serve to identify them. It is only exceptionally that a law-abiding state resorts to administrative acts. We have to defend ourselves, therefore: through the identification, isolation, and paralyzation (of such acts or agents), through acquiring a habit of discipline of secrecy surrounding the actions, the real actions, not our innocent daily lives.

That is why denunciations of the kind practised by Késars, Visciani and Gretziani cannot be motivated even by hypocrisy, as being imposed by the need to defend us, the exiles, or the country that gives us asylum. Used as weapons against competitors, they give no results. To be satisfied with having struck a blow at an adversary, merely because one has caused him the unpleasantness of a statement to the police, is not only abject: it is petty. One does not merely scratch an adversary.