

ther questionable whether they had known what they have been doing at all or not. However, there was one exception, represented by the voice of the former *Securitate* agent on the phone, who leaves no doubt about his reputation at the time and after seventeen years, when he speaks as a respectable citizen and a venture capitalist.

This narrative, which establishes the whole film metaphor, of course, crosses the border of Romania and indicates relationships of political considerations in most transition countries. No matter how clear it is that in the years of social disruptions something decisive happened, it should also be noticeable that in all countries there are on-going never-ending struggles for interpretation of those events. In this new social space, designated by such co-ordinates, films, starting with the Porumboiu's film do not interfere with definite direct statements – like films in the era of national cinematographies did albeit in many metonymic ways – but rather with visual descriptions, ambiguous gestures, often poetic visual “discourse” and, above all, with a universally comprehensible genre or artistic cinematic reflections on social realities.

Political Epistemological Break

Porumboiu's film, therefore, delivers a readable epistemological break effect considering the role of political signification in films, which were produced in the Balkans, especially those shot in former communist countries in the area. The film marks a point at which a space of political signification opens to deconstructive re-structuring: a troubling opposition “democracy versus dictatorship” is now rendered to the past, considering that the whole framework of political culture becomes unclear as opposed to the times of one Party rule. Porumboiu's film could unmistakably be taken as an allegory of the dubious comprehending of the happenings of 1989 as a revolution, which brought about the fall of communism. However, taking into account the film's interrogatory ironic vision, the very significance of this so-called revolution could be read in retrospect in view of Badiou's criticism and its central notion as the “non-event” (Badiou, 2003: 129).² The film therefore re-configured the whole field, in which historical meanings of the times after the World War II are being disputed, reflected upon and, final-

2 As Badiou noted in his reflection of the end of communism, what was mistakenly apprehended as a social change remained a matter of the State. The reorganization of the State alone is, according to his theory of event, hardly something that would bring with it an emancipatory breakthrough, the invention of something radically new.