By Enamol Goldman

So, the weekend has finally come around, and you think, why not take in a movie? You've read of the success of "A Man Called Horse"... Richard Schickel, or your Joe Morgenstern, or your Emanuel Goldin, or your Zabroski, or your Poe or your Schickel, or your Joe Morgan--or, if you like, pretty much know what's good and what isn't. But there may be choices. Maybe you'd like to be sure about it. Would it be appropriate for your teenage daughter? Maybe your spouse's stomach isn't too strong, or maybe he or she has a refined sense of taste? Or, maybe you're in the mood for something no one but you and your bored adult entertainers? So, you look at the ratings and see a G (general admission), GP (parental guidance suggested), R (under 17 admitted only), or X (under 17 not admitted).

That's the answer, the question, shouldn't it?

Wrong. After two years of reviewing films, I have come to the realization that the rating a film receives may have as much to do with the politics of the Board of Review of the film as with the degree of sexually "objectionable" material. Sure, there is a correlation to nudity and sexuality in the ratings, but even this is linked to politics more than to strict morality. I don't believe it has anything to do with the part of the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA).

On what basis do I make these allegations? Consider the following examples: The Landlord and Pieces of a Dream are both rated R. They contain no nudity; however, they are out to the left, politically. The Landlord is sympathetic to interracial romance, and Pieces of a Dream is sympathetic to a priest who challenges the requirement of celibacy.

On the other hand, the following films contain varying degrees of nudity, and are rated X: Sea Train on the Rain, and Wedding Night. Although Greene has gotten rid of some of the fancy excesses as the lyricist which he certainly could like to be sure about. Would it be appropriate for your teenage daughter? Maybe your spouse's stomach isn't too strong, or maybe he or she has a refined sense of taste? Or, maybe you're in the mood for something no one but you and your bored adult entertainers? So, you look at the ratings and see a G (general admission), GP (parental guidance suggested), R (under 17 admitted only), or X (under 17 not admitted).
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