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Film review....

Private Vices, Public Virtues. Miklos Jancso’s latest film, is such a feast for the senses - vibrant music, rich coloring, warm, frank sensuality - that it comes as something of a shock to realise how tame and even tedious the whole exercise is. You can manufacture a continuing low level of interest in it, of course, by spotting the Jancso trademarks - dialogue so sparse that it tempts you to dismiss the story line outright, visuals so lovingly dwelled upon that you break your brains trying to squeeze as much significance out of the scene as the director obviously does, ritual stripping, the humiliation motif, etc. But such high-art gamesmanship soon palls, and you are left with a somewhat dense, but basically centre-less film featuring small doses of inchoate politics and large doses of curiously sexless sex.

Many of Jancso’s earlier films, however elliptical in form, are recognisably “about” revolution or the forms of popular expression that make revolution an imaginable possibility. Round-Up, The Confrontation, The Red and the White, Red Psalm are concerned with the struggles of “the people” (peasants/students) against repressive forces, and with the collective activities which nourish revolutionary vision. It is...
The acts of intercourse themselves, the fluid dimensionality of the music, all attest to Jancso's exploration of "pure" sensuality. Given even the sketchy social context of the preceding explicitly sexual scenes, this apparently unmotivated final passage appears decisively abstract, the eroticism ultimately reified. The total effect - despite beautiful bodies in beautiful embraces - is cerebral rather than emotional.

At the film's end, the four sensualists, sacrificially recumbent under a white cloth, are ritually executed. As the bodies are prepared for burial, we hear the "official" announcement of a royal suicide; the bodies lie in state, the revolt without strategy has been quashed and its historical existence denied.

The problem is how to relate Jancso's final extended sexual exegesis to its eventual defeat by the authoritarian forces. Does it represent something as uncomplicated as a final fling, a last sowing in the life of the senses before the executioner strikes? Or is it purpose to subject Jancso's audiences to a lesson in sensuality, to its didactic portrayal as non-threatening and expressive, rather than dominating and instrumental? Is it merely a somewhat overstated illustration of the means by which these four already atypical people have generated the courage to oppose the regime, and to die for their high-minded "cause" of truth? Or is it a statement as to the poverty of the Reichian solution, that sexuality alone provides neither tactics nor strategy for a real revolution against entrenched forces of repression.

In light of Jancso's other films, the last explanation would fit with his previously expressed preoccupations with the mechanisms of revolutionary vision. Unfortunately, the film itself gives too little justification for such a view. It would be a perverse stretching of the film to over-emphasise the anti-Reichian point. But if Private Vices isn't about the revolutionary possibilities inherent in sensual life, then you're stuck to know what the hell it is about. Clues are so sparse, guidance so absent, that you are left with the obvious: it is a film celebrating sex, from the Playboyan camerawork in the orgy scenes (open bodices, garters, long stockings for the ladies) to the final sequences where the screen is totally absorbed and suffused in flesh tones. If there is a political motif, it comes either in a bourgeois, literary guise - allusions to Shakespeare's rebels (Hamlet, Prince Hal, Romeo and Juliet) abound - or in the form of absolutist symbolism: Life versus Death; Spirit versus Order; Sensuality versus The State. The result is, I fear, simply a formal film exercise by a director entranced with his own images and his own undoubted abilities to translate these images onto celluloid, who has simply run out of political steam.

- Kathe Boehringer.