The Gateway

Film Funeral home humour haunts Beetlejuice

The Geffen Film Company Capitol Square, Gateway, West Mall 5

review by David Smith Matever happened to subtley? Remember the good old days when you went to the movies, and if a scary or disgusting part can be a subtle and the start of the start and the scare because moviem th matter anyway because moviema allowed to show guts and goo?

allowed to show guis and goor Well, those days are goine, and for proof, I refer you to a new comedy/horror film called Beetlevice. From Tim Burton, the man who brought you Pee Wee's Big Ad-venture, comes more Hollywood gore than most people can appreciate. Actually, these two pictures have more in common than just two pictures have more in common than just a director: both of them involve very surreal landscapes, strange storylines, and stars who are more adept at directing themselves than at being directed.

at being directed. I am, of course, referring to Michael Keaton, who fairly walks through this picture; this man (er, ghost) can fire off a myriad of one-lines and fast-punches without even blinking. Whenever he is on screen (which does not happen nearly enough), he manages to dominate every shot of film with his thoroughly repulsive, crude, and yet cease-lessly (unny antics.

Keaton's Betelgeuse, who has nothing to do with either the star in the sky, the biblical personality, or any of the other 22 known references, is 'the ghost with the most', the 'Afterlife's Leading Bio-exorcist', and all-a-round troublemaker.

neuse - repulsive, crude, yet ceaselessly funny. Michael Keaton as Betelo Betelgeuse is hired by Barbara (Geena Davis) and Adam (Alec Baldwin) Maitland, two unhappy ghosts who have been confined to their old house following their accidental Davis

death. Although warned not to, they summ him to help frighten away the morons who have purchased and tastelessly "renovated" once-beautiful home. Betelgeuse

Homosexuality in England at the turn of the century

Maurice Princess Theatre April 8 - April 14

review by Peter Cole

his film adaptation of E. M. Forster's novel of the same name deals with Maurice Hall's sexual development while he is at Cambridge in the first decade of this century

decade of this century. At first he is horrified when one of his churns, Clive Durham (Hugh Grant) makes a overt pass at him. Overcoming this shock. Maurice (James Wilky) develops a deep love for Clive but he required relationship is brief and ends unhappily. Maurice is deeply hurt and eventually tries to have his homosexual urges purged through hypnosis.

The hypotisti, Laker-Jones (Ben Kingsley) employs strange methods to try to exorcise "the stream of longing" from Maurice but gives up and suggests that he move to France or Italy where the gender of one's loved one

is not so important. Maurice, though hurt by Clive's rejection of him and by his subsequent marriage.

spenck much of his free time at Pendersleigh, the Durham estate: There he is surrounded by beautiful, bright, witty women, Though fond of the lamily and ever-present guests, Maurice is not completely happy until he is assilled by Alee Scudder (Rupert Graves), the gameskeeper's assistant. Scudder mounts a ladder at midnight and interjects himself unannounced into Maurice's room and his life. Atriad that this association with a member of the working class will result in blackmail, Maurice resolves to hypnotise homosexuality out of his system: It doesn't work. home work.

Though the cinematography is engaging and seductive, at times it leaves one feeling uninvolved, removed. This film hasn't the sweeping pans and grand panoramas of A Room With A View nor has it so universal an Room with A view nor has it so universal an appeal; but it does present atmosphere and pathos sensitively. The overall editing is somewhat jerky because the film tries to incorporate too much of the book. The transition from scene to scene was often abrupt.

Overall, Maurice left one feeling dis-

satisfied because so many ideas and relation

ships remain unresolved. The director (James lvory) tries so hard to present the audience with a feeling of time and place that the

development of the characters suffers. It is worth seeing but be prepared to fill a lot of blanks which the film's smooth dialogue is unable to do.

<text><text><text><text><text>

self-destruct towards the end, and I wasn't sure what I was watching. If you like "gore humour", good special effects, and the unpredictability of Michael Keaton, then rush off to see it. If, on the other hand, you hate a shaky plot (no pun intended), redundant and incessantly heavy "funceral humour" (that's dished out by the shovel load), and a stereotyped view of the afterlife. Trecommend that you save your money and wait until it hits the video stores.







