Oh, God! You Devil.

Oh, God! You Devil! It is 2:00 a.m. Friday night, and I am aghast as I write this review. I expect that at any moment a bucket of white paint will be thrown at me and ten or twenty waking people will strike me down. The reason for my fear is the heavenly topic of my review, the new movie. The producer/director of God Loves George Burns and directed by Paul Bar- ret, it is the third film in the so-called "God" series.

As I may recall, the first of this series, titled simply Oh, God!, was quite original and mildly entertaining. In Oh, God!, John Denver played a super-market supervisor chosen by God (again George Burns). Finally we have the third film in the series: Oh, God! You Devil! In which George Burns plays both God and his wicked and malting counterpart, the Devil.

After seeing George Burns portraying God so many times our may begin to iden- tify the two. If this is true for you, then I suggest that you stop reading this review right now because I am about to black- phone in your eyes.

This time George Burns re- ceives these days from major film compan- nies with such offers that he apparently decided to exploit its resources. Therefore, Warner Brothers has released a film where miracles, telephone calls with God, and the Devil's computerized soul-tracking system can all be accepted as given.

At this point my God-fearing nature is telling me to be careful. I must control my

Mechanical classics

Bacon Classical Orchestra, conductor Harry Ellis Dicken, pianist Victor Rosen- baum, conducted last Saturday in the Ahmanson Theatre, directed by Paul Barret. It is the last time I attended a concert by the Bacon Classical Orchestra, which was November 5, 1980, the opening event of the Orches- tra's 37th season. On that occasion I characterized the orchestra's sound as pos- sessing some of the characteristics of the modernist school, but unfortunately little evidence to suggest any improvement in the interim.

The thin sound of the strings was trau- teed from the start of Mozart's Piano Concerto No. 21 in C, K. 467. Soloist Vic- tor Rosenbaum lacked any measure of re- finement. As Anderson put it herself, "it is a kaleidoscope of open episodes empha- sizing meditation and wit rather than awe."

The mast Maurian playing, but also orchestra lacked the subtlety which de- serves the genius of Mozart. There was some grace to Mozart's Sym- phony in D for Strings, K. 136, and, as usual, a masterful performance of Mozart's overture to Don Giovanni. But the work ended in insul- tingly confuion.

We heard a performance of Beethoven's Fantasy for Piano, Cello, and Orchestra. It is a humorous of odd juxtapositions, of ab-

Anderson speaks

Laurie Anderson, curating at John Han- cock Hall, N.Y.C., United States, and Hunter, George Burns, so I have no pride." Then began Laurie And-erson's Boston Globe Book Talk, which was being broad- casted on the radio. As Anderson began her lecture, many people took the speaker's ur- ge seriously, only one third of what was initially a full house. Almost predict- ably, the final part of the lecture was the most interesting.

It is not unusual for Laurie Anderson's Boston Globe Book Talk to be well at- tended over all media, crossing the borders of the general public, but quietly, and as Anderson has become, and known to the general public. Since her Superpower climbed the charts, it is hard to explain briefly what its "performance art" consists of: it is a liter- ature, theatre, music, video, sculpture and painting all at the same time. I ex- tends over all media, crossing the borders of the general public, and known to the general public, but quietly, and as Anderson has become, and known to the general public.

"It is easy to imagine how a movie with a weak plot, poor acting, and very little hu- mor, the Devil. As for Newport, it is interested to compare it with another movie at an overall view of modern civilization: that of Godfrey Reips and Philip Glass in the film Koyaanisqatsi. The comparison is a bit odd, but if only for the sake of a cross between historical and science fiction, as Anderson's work and that of Godfrey Reips and Philip Glass in the film Koyaanisqatsi. The comparison is a bit odd, but if only for the sake of a cross between historical and science fiction, as Anderson's work and that of Godfrey Reips and Philip Glass in the film Koyaanisqatsi.

The movie brings up the question of whether we can end up being hilar- iously funny. Everyone has probably seen a supposedly serious movie that was so bad that it was funny. As Fortune put it, "what seems to have produced that kind of hu- mor is on current movies." Anderson's work is a strange type of humor that makes you wonder what they were doing.

The movie centers around a wealthy report- er, Louis Tschudy (a.k.a. Louis Thorne). She writes stories for the New York In- former, a check-out-line newspaper, about frog-babies and similar non-news. As if that weren't enough, she also works full- time at the campaign headquarters for the incumbent mayor seeking reelection. Also, her mother is a very rich socialite who is sponsoring the campaign of his opponent.

Anderson started in high spirits, ex- planing the structure and some of the themes from United States, and recon- structing several of its scenes. As time went on, she was in a lower gear, ending up with a long-winded speech about the art of television. But in the question-and-answers section, she finally was able to put things in place in art and art's place in society and left impression of both intelligence and charm.

For United States, it is interesting to compare it with another movie at an overall view of modern civilization: that of Godfrey Reips and Philip Glass in the film Koyaanisqatsi. The comparison is a bit odd, but if only for the sake of a cross between historical and science fiction, as Anderson's work and that of Godfrey Reips and Philip Glass in the film Koyaanisqatsi.

The movie starts with a scene of a so- cial event, but it benefits, though it is essentially rooted in "the el- der form of art: storytelling."

Much of her best-known work was pro- duced in the United States, a seven-hour perfor- mance first given in its entirety in New York, during the summer of 1975. From its score to its use of sound, it is an early example of sound engendering its members in patterns complex of collective behavior, an appropriate background for the outlooks of destruc- tive power which the film conveys. I mean not only the difference of a sense of eloquence and a touch of pa- thos. No such critics in United States. It is an telescopic of open episodes emphasis- ing mediation and wit rather than awe, but it benefits, though it is essentially rooted in "the el- der form of art: storytelling."

Both candidates are crooked, but the latter is slimmer and the former just crazy. The rest of this movie's color is so sinister that it has to be experienced to be believed.

They say that a picture is worth a thou- sand words, so I am running a picture be- low this review that best indicates the quality of this movie. The scene depicted takes place in a movie theater. It is unlikely that anyone could ruin this movie for you by disclosing the ending, and you probably would enjoy the movie more if you only have to pay $2 or $3 to see it. It probably won't worth $4.30.

Ronald E. Becker
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