

Re: Review of the film 300

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.archaeology/2008-03/msg00492.html>

- *From:* "Peter Jason" <pj@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 22 Mar 2008 09:52:00 +1100
-

"Matt Giwer" <jull43@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote in message
[news:47e31c98\\$0\\$4971\\$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:47e31c98$0$4971$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Peter Jason wrote:

"Matt Giwer"
<jull43@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
message
[news:47ddcc78\\$0\\$6126\\$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](news:47ddcc78$0$6126$4c368faf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Hayabusa wrote:

On Fri, 14 Mar 2008 15:36:04 -0400,
Scotius <yodasbud@xxxxxxx> wrote:
Forget it. I saw it. It is the movie
about a comicbook, and a splatter
movie. The wall of dead bodies is quite
impressive, and the scene
created on the computer where the
Persian fleet is smashed to pieces
by a violent sea is impressive too. The
rest is a waste of time.

If you like comic books it isn't bad. No
worse than Batman and Superman. But when
I read Iran complaining about it I had
the thought of New Yorkers complaining
about their portrayal in comic books.
The CGI technique is excellent. It gets
over the hurdle of face quality by using
real faces. Faces look OK if clearly
computer graphics but they get more and
more annoying the closer to human they
look. No one has made computer faces good
enough yet. So like in Beowulf a 5'8"
actor of normal build with a good voice
can play the lead. If this had been

Re: Review of the film 300

around 30 years ago we could have been spared Arnold in Conan. They would not need midgets in supporting roles for Sylvester Stalone movies.

Of course it is a technique looking for scripts but it makes possible a lot of scenes that would be unaffordable or impossible with real sets and to hard to integrate real actors into a graphics background sets.

Disclaimer: I first went to Jurassic Park to see the computer graphics.

I thought Arnie was perfect as Conan! Remember that towering scene when Conan was tied crucifixion-like as JHC to a dead tree and left to die of exposure amongst a horde of expectant vultures?

Yes but Conan was an Austrian? No, I am not a kneejerk against his characterization.

The Austrian didn't bother me. He was still growing as an actor when he nailed the role. And he got is having the build for it and fitting the director's vision of the character. One assumes compromises. Now consider ANY actor could have done the role and the body added.

I just got a copy of the original release and the TV release cuts a philosophical discussion with Subatai that is out of place for Arnie's character. He doesn't deliver it well. Consider an actor who could deliver it well and we saw a Conan who had been educated in the philosophy of Sung and portrayed it.

And how the setting sun turned all his steroid-muscles to shimmering gold as he began to succumb?

But if Richard Burton had CGI muscles ...
Bad choice. Consider the best possible actor for a highly educated warrior who

will become a wise king even if he is 5'8"
and see him in the role with all the
muscles. That is just about the actor who
did Beowulf -- same height anyway.

And how an impatient vulture decided to
jump the gun and take a bite out of Arnie
before he was truly dead and tender?
And how Conan summoned his last ounce (28
grams) of strength and bit its fucking
head clean off...?

You did not see a head bitten off. The cut
made it look like you did. But with CGI you
could see the bite and the blood spurt as
we did in 300 -- although I have problem
with parts of that animation as two
dimensional in the wrong places. There is a
pan shot of spurting blood that is clearly
two dimensional as seen in the pan. I have
no idea what they thought they were doing
and suspect the editor wanted something and
this were proof/test frames that were not
originally intended for the movie.

I don't think you will ever make a film
critic! How could CGI ever come close to
this?

As a matter of fact the film critics hated
Arnie but if any were here and supported me
I would point out why they were and are all
wrong. At the time and with no CGI I think
it was a great movie. It is only now some
30 years later that the state of the art
can imagine a better production of the
movie.

And they didn't really hate him. The
newspapers hired for the viewpoint not the
content. At the time a local radio show
(WTOP, DC, back when I lived there) had a
movie reviewer. He loved the movie as I
did. But a few weeks after it came out he
was hired by the Wash Post as their chief
reviewer and suddenly he did not like it.

And AFTER he was with the Post I heard him criticizing scenes that were not in movies. Either the critics were shown a different version or they were repeating Hollywood press releases. I assume the latter.

So if you thought I was one of those, I am not. I have it and still watch it every so often.

The sequel sucked.

An example of CGI overkill was the recent and very-long movie "Kong" in which all stops were pulled out in the jungle scenes showing various monsters of the Cretaceous having their wicked way with the crew of a ship trying (at that stage) to rescue some blond bimbo kidnapped by this huge tender-hearted ape.

This post is most relevant because it reveals the presence of mammalia, in the form of this giant ape, during the Cretaceous period. Together with a decidedly ugly tribe of dishevelled Australopithecines with anger and vengeful issues.

Due to some marvel of cosmetic science this blond bimbo maintained her composure (and hair coiffe) through a dinosaur brawl, swings thru the trees, being swung about by Kong, rescued by her inamorato, and suffered no more than a small scratch. Curiously, in this movie, it was only those handsome men who survived because the giant insects, dinosaurs and other worthies had this prediction for ugly people and Afro-Americans, some of whom were clearly Jewish.

The CGI triumph was the killing of the aforementioned, and now clearly broken-hearted "Kong" on top of the Empire State Bldg and this was very well done indeed, giving the viewer a feeling of vertigo, a feeling augmented by the rising-sun dawn and sweeping vistas.

Typically, like "300", the story was a

Re: Review of the film 300

pastiche of cheap nonsense. (To have Kong consummate his love with the Blond Bimbo would have required great feats of elasticity). But in artistic terms these movies have the choreography of good ballet and when viewed with this insight are very enjoyable indeed. It's a bit like high-quality porn, which is very hard to find.

We breathlessly await Wagner's Ring in CGI.