

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Python 3.6.1 (v3.6.1:69c0db5, Mar 21 2017, 17:54:52) [MSC v.1900 32 bit (Intel)] on win32

Type "copyright", "credits" or "license()" for more information.

>>>

RESTART: C:\Users\winbr\Documents\research\importing data\phase II\knowledgeBase.py

```
['/title/tt3348730?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=1KXRN5X8F18KCBR4ZDG0&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_ch_t0',
'/title/tt6217804?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=1KXRN5X8F18KCBR4ZDG0&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_ch_t1',
'/title/tt1981128?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=1KXRN5X8F18KCBR4ZDG0&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_ch_t2',
'/title/tt5308322?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=1KXRN5X8F18KCBR4ZDG0&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_ch_t3',
'/title/tt1856101?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=1KXRN5X8F18KCBR4ZDG0&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_ch_t4',
'/title/tt3402236?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=1971069222&pf_rd_r=1KXRN5X8F18KCBR4ZDG0&pf_rd_s=right-8&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cs_t0',
'/title/tt5657846?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=1971069222&pf_rd_r=1KXRN5X8F18KCBR4ZDG0&pf_rd_s=right-8&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cs_t1',
'/title/tt5027774?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=1971069222&pf_rd_r=1KXRN5X8F18KCBR4ZDG0&pf_rd_s=right-8&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cs_t2',
'/title/tt6304046?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=1971069222&pf_rd_r=1KXRN5X8F18KCBR4ZDG0&pf_rd_s=right-8&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cs_t3']
```

tt3348730

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=20>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=30>

tt6217804

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=20>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=30>

tt1981128

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=20>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=30>

tt5308322

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=20>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=30>

tt1856101

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=20>

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=30>
tt3402236
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=0>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=10>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=20>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=30>
tt5657846
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=0>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=10>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=20>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=30>
tt5027774
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=0>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=10>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=20>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=30>
tt6304046
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=0>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=10>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=20>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=30>
['<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=20>',

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

```
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=30',  
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=0',  
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=10',  
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=20',  
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=30',  
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=0',  
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=10',  
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=20',  
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=30']
```

4

Since the Saw franchise is one of my biggest guilty pleasures when it comes to horror, I've been hoping for a new installment ever since The Final Chapter was supposed to end the franchise back in 2010. Even though the movies got progressively worse, there is something about this franchise that always draws me back and makes me want to re-watch it.

I had high expectations for Jigsaw because of two reasons: one, the producers stated in an interview that they were offered more than a hundred scripts for a new movie from different writers, but had never been pleased with any of them until they discovered a script so good, which ultimately got picked to be adapted; second, the Spierig brothers, Jigsaw's directors, had previously directed Predestination, such a smart and enticing sci-fi time-travel movie that I liked quite a lot.

After seeing Jigsaw, I left the theater disappointed. I'll start with what I enjoyed:

The score by Charlie Clouser is just as fabulous as it has always been and manages to go in line perfectly with each scene.

The performances didn't bother me at all, although none of the actors really gets to shine. Laura Vandervoort and Paul Braunstein stood out here, with the latter generating some funny moments worthy of admiration.

The direction was very polished and the movie was competently filmed, but the Spierig brothers weren't given much to show their creativity on. This leads me to the negatives.

The CGI is very good. There is, however, one scene in which I was feeling as if I was watching one of the most recent Resident Evil movies and that didn't really work for me.

What I didn't like:

The ideas in this movie and its overall plot are somewhat underdeveloped. I know that this is supposed to be a new beginning; for these movies, but as a franchise starter, I wanted more to be explored. The plot falls flat because the movie cuts from scene to scene so swiftly and tries to cram multiple narratives into 85 minutes, that ultimately none of them makes an impact.

Saw is known for its visceral traps and torture devices, so I was looking forward to seeing more of that. However, the game presented in this movie has next to no memorable traps. That is because they are a lot tamer than what we've seen before and they simply can't hold a

candle to all the ingenious traps from the past movies.

The character development is another issue in this movie. The characters are so uni-dimensional, with some of them being there only to fill the screen. And I'm referring to some of the main casting here. Also, character arcs are left unfinished and the movie felt like it ended when the most important part of the story was about to happen.

The editing undermines what could've been some very suspenseful scenes because of its sloppiness, by cutting from one narrative (the game) to the other (the investigation) at random moments.

Now, it all comes down to the twist. Was it good and unexpected? Well, no, not really. It's not necessarily because you can predict it from miles away (for which the movie offers hints throughout the run-time) due to its small set of characters, but because it had no resonance for me. It didn't blow me away and you could've predicted it from the marketing of the movie alone. Just like with the traps, it just doesn't have the same visceral feel as the past movies and it doesn't really make you crave for the release of the next chapter.

Overall, Jigsaw sets itself apart from the previous movies in the series with the help of the two directors who manage to make the movie look stylish and slick, but ultimately, it doesn't succeed in creating the sense of urgency that some of the old movies had and, sadly, disappoints on almost every other level. And yes, there are fan-service moments, but as a fan of this franchise, I felt very little excitement when they happened.

Hopefully, if the movie does well in terms of box office, the sequel will improve upon this franchise "reinvention".

6

As a saw geek, i thought the film was a good film for an average movie goer, but for a fan of the franchise i found it underwhelming. the "he had another apprentice all along" was lazy in my opinion. The idea Elanor was really Cortbett from saw 3 carrying on jigsaws work (she was around 11 yrs old in saw 3, so the age ties in 7 years on) - this would have been a far more inventive and plausible option than some random character that we are told was on the scene long before Hoffman and Amanda is too weak in my opinion. I also think, making you believe Jigsaw is alive again, only to find out it is scenes from 10 years ago is like giving a kid a Christmas present and taking it away again. However clever, leaves you disappointed. Frustrating. I understand the series needed re-inventing for the new audience, but to forget its old fan base and not have any mention at all of Hoffman, Amanda or Dr Gordon is like ordering Chocolate cake and getting trifle. whilst trifle is nice, its not what you wanted. There are certain rules in a saw film that jigsaw sticks too, well so should the producers.. even if those characters aren't appearing, they should have included someone, even if in name only, especially Dr Gordon as he was alive and well only 7yrs ago and would have known about Logan surely. All in all, a

decent film. For a saw fan though its a little disappointing

8

"Let's Play A Game";, those simple words haunted the theaters for years,

signaling the start of yet another slasher movie in the Saw series. What started out as a unique twist to the serial killer saga was only the start to a face cringing, spine tingling, sometimes nauseating saga that hooked people in until around the sixth-seventh iteration when it finally ended. That was until this year, where the saga was to be reanimated in hopes of bringing more bucks to the theaters. Will this eighth installment have the ability to defy death like it's protagonist antihero, or is it dead like the poor victims of his games. Only one way to find out and that is read my friends, so let's get started!

LIKES:

Fast-Pace: With all the slow movies I have been seeing, I give props to

the Saw series maintaining their consistent pace. From start to finish, the tale keeps moving, sparing no second for unnecessary details or attempts at prolonged character development. The mystery of figuring out the identity of the game master, mixed with the spread-out trials that promise a messy end are well-balanced to keep things going.

Decent Characters: A horror movie often has many brain-dead characters begging to be chainsaw fodder. Fortunately, Saw movies continue to choose players who have a little more complexity and skills than many of the Spring Break teens favored. The tradition lives on, as each player has a little more buried within, still having a few obviously destined corpses, but others who have a shot at making it out. And for those not in the game, but trying to solve the mystery, they too have some layers to them that may or may not be pertinent to the story. It's those engaging elements that are crafted in the story, making them more engaging to follow.

The Presentation: Another component I still like is the presentation of

the movie. Many go for the kills, but the better component for me is how they separate the story into two settings. One is still the players trying to escape the closes thing to hell's torture chamber, while the other are the outside characters hunting down the "maniac" that continues to weave his traps. The ability to entangle these two components, balancing their timing to provide clues and hints to the story all while keeping you invested in the game. Such a dynamic presentation provides those checks and balances necessary for a slasher movie, and keeping things as fresh as possible.

Twist: As many of you know, Saw movies are all about the ability to throw that last wrench into the gears to blow your mind. Despite my experience with predicting endings, this one got me. The questions I asked were on the right path, but they were able to drop enough interfering factors to throw me off the trail. Jigsaw once again impresses me with their storytelling, and their mastery of

presentation. I can't say much more, but ask the right questions and you might get the answers.

DISLIKES:

Lazy Deaths: Those first few movies were convoluted in their traps.

They had designed devices that were an impressive display of imagination, horror, and engineering that gave everyone a kick in terms of design. While Jigsaw still has the impressive connections and storytelling, it unfortunately fails in the terms of the traps themselves. They are surprisingly simple for the most part, and a little more reserved than I expected in this modern era. Yes, there is still plenty of blood in this battle for moral consequences, but they didn't involve quite as much skin crawling madness.

Acting a little cheesy: Despite the engaging characters, there are times when there are a few inconsistencies in the character's intelligence, or often the case their acting. While decent for the most part, the writers hit some blocks in terms of dialogue or direction they wanted the characters to go. There are those moments the "tension" overwhelms them into hysterical messes that are cheesy rather than believable. In addition, the dialogue sometimes gets lazy, just going into expletives than conducive dialog. A weak dislike yes, but I'm drawing on straws.

The potential for a series: Like the original series, I had hoped for

an ending, but then this movie showed up. While I did enjoy it, I am worried that the way this movie ends sets up the potential for a new series to start. Sure, this means more Saw goodness, but it also means the potential to dilute this movie into another run of the mill series that will become a product of lazy producing. Hopefully that won't happen, but these days series are the prize most companies seek.

The VERDICT:

Jigsaw is the piece of the puzzle that brings quality back to the lovely massacre series. Going back to the roots, the writers were able to bring back a brilliant presentation and characters you can follow. All the nostalgic qualities rush in with the deadly traps, bringing that fast-pace, twisting tale that captivated us all those years ago. While still not the first movie, especially in terms of death design and potential to revive the series, it was a welcome addition to the series. So, if you are looking for the horror movie of the month, Jigsaw is your answer for the theater my friends.

My scores:

Crime/Horror/Mystery: 8.5 Movie Overall: 7.0

9

Jigsaw doesn't have over the top traps, where you chop off your arm (Saw VI). OR impossible traps where you put your hand in a jar of acid to retrieve a key just to get your chest ripped open (Saw III). History repeats itself and Jigsaw goes back to their old roots being simple, with basic traps and a mind blowing ending. Unfortunately there's one trap I disliked, it involves lasers. It relies on CGI too much, the stakes are high but the practical traps are way more fun and creative. With wires, tricks, chains, a puppet and the classic pig head, this

film will leave you with a smile on your face.

7

October 26, 2017 Middle East Premiere Dubai
It's been 10 years since the death of John Kramer known as the Jigsaw.

But, some bodies are discovered, the investigation leads to the conclusion that Kramer is back...!! Now, the Officials are chasing the dead.
Saw released in 2004 was one of the best Gore, Slasher Suspense Horror Thrillers. After the completion of film school, Director James Wan with his friend Leigh Whannell wanted to make a short film, but limitations hold their hands. Hence, they decided to make something that has limited location, actors etc. This short film of 9 minutes gave green signal to the Saw movie. But, the franchise was rated straight down from Part 1 to 7.
This movie is from the Directors of Predestination (2014), Spierig

Brothers... hold on, don't expect much. But, if you are a fan of Saw film, you can take a breath. Definitely this is not as bad as the previous installments.
Mostly, a cocktail of the previous films. The beginning was really good, it had hope and expectations about the movie. This dropped soon. But, managed to pick up towards the end.

6

Jigsaw is back for an eighth film after several years from the conclusion of a terrible supposedly final chapter saw movie. Jigsaw is an okay film, its not terrible neither good. With directors The Spierig Brothers direction and a new set of writers trying to bring back the Jigsaw killer. There was a way of continuing on with the franchise either with a new twists that tries to bring back the torture porn of death traps and either a new killer or perhaps Jigsaw's legacy was not over.
I enjoyed the first few Saw films from the bloody gory death traps, the

connection on how every victim has with each other, and the twists that is played with Charlie Clouser's music theme in the final minute of the movies. As every film goes on, it just feels like they straying away from the plots connection and having new victims that has no connections and more bloody traps. Jigsaw film however, does not feel like a Saw movie. The plot feels more like a police procedural drama, were Det. Halloran (Callum Keith Rennie) is following up a case were bodies are discovered. And same with the video tapes of Jigsaw's voice (Tobin Bell). Is the Jigsaw really dead? Or is there a new Jigsaw copycat that is taking over his games? Halloran is trying to follow a lead that has several people playing the game in a hidden barn. Were they are fighting for their lives of going through several death traps, as they are suppose to solve the clues to why they are there. With the help from forensic pathologist Logan and Eleanor (Matt Passmore and

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Hannah Emily Anderson). They are trying to solve their own mystery when traces of evidence is leading back to Jigsaw being alive and the connections every victim has with each other.

The plot played like a TV police procedural drama which took away from the Saw movies feel. It was fun to see Halloran trying to solve the mystery with the victims and Jigsaw. And then the movie flashes back to the victims in the barn, who are forced to play a game that will end bloody.

The death traps and the bloody sequences are quick and less gory than the previous seven films. And the traps are also quite forgettable this time. Sure, for the audience that can not handle blood and gore will still find this disturbing.

There are also a couple of unpredictable twists that works with the film and is what leaves you talking about it. Definitely not as great as the first film. The cast was also decent. Matt Passmore is a fun new addition. Callum Keith Rennie was okay. And the cast of victims that were forced in death traps are not easily memorable.

Like all horror films, the first couple are usually the best and the rest are just repeats with less of a plot. And this film does not add or bring anything new to the direction of the franchise. Overall, Jigsaw is a fair horror film. The twists works well. The thrills is decent with the victims being forced to injure themselves to survive. The plot does not feel like the Saw movies. And the death traps are forgettable.

I rate the film 3 out of 5 stars. I ll recommend it if you want to watch a bloody torture porn film or if your into that. Otherwise, I ll suggest it as a rental.

7

I have seen the first 3 movies in the series as the reviews of the successors were not good. But I am happy that they made reference to these movies. And this time no flashbacks!

The production design and visuals (gore and blood) were genuine for the viewer to believe. The traps are quite forgettable this time but the twists and turns were very good as I didn't see that coming in the end.

An attempt being made by the directors to make it comparable with the first two installments. Though there are some flaws in the middle, but the ending justified the shortcomings!

Worth your money!

7

I'm fan of Saw franchise since I was teenager, so my hype about this new entry was so high. The movie has 2 plots, one showing 5 victims needing to survive to the dangerous games of Jigsaw and other telling us the story about a police department investigating some stranger homicides.

The plot about the surviving group is nice, there are some creative

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

traps, however there's less violence and bloody scenes than in the previous entries and also has some plot holes, for example Jigsaw seems to know who would survive since the beginning. During the middle of the movie I was wondering "how's possible Jigsaw recorded a tape with the name of that character? How he knows that character is alive? He could die during the beginning of the game". Meanwhile, the plot about the polices gives us some great twists and I'm sure you won't see them coming.

Jigsaw is a sequel with some reboot elements, doesn't change the horror genre, but is funny and I suggest it for who wants to turn off the brain for 90 minutes and just enjoy a nice movie. It's not the best Saw film, however is one of the bests.

6

I was a huge fan of the original series, although as more films were released the thrill lessened. The first is a Classic and may have one of the best twists of all time, and that's what makes it such a great film. It wasn't about the horror.

This one, although entertaining, same awkward acting by many characters, same grizzly traps, and most of all a twist, which I believe everyone expects, however I feel there's some major plot holes that leaves me feeling dissatisfied. Of course I won't ruin for anyone, but this film reaches far, way too far, in my humble opinion.

Very reminiscent of the original, but fails in the end. Maybe they'll do better next time because a new Saw film is always welcome to take a swing.

Note: the red headed coroner was super hot, even before she let her hair down and took her glasses off. Way too hot to be a coroner. (not being sexist, just keeping it real)

6

Saw is back and Jigsaw has returned to reclaim Halloween. But, you'll immediately find yourself confused. After all, Jigsaw has been dead for many years. As soon as you start watching a lot of things just don't make even a hint of sense. Everything seems jumbled up... until the film's many twists and turns become clear and, with yet another rising crescendo of the iconic theme tune, a series of flashbacks, big reveals and gory images, a Saw film once more concludes seemingly laughing at its audience and said audience will once more leave feeling sick to the stomach and very confused. Yep, Saw is back... for better or for worse? In this case, for better. Kind of. After the horrendous last installment, the only good part of Jigsaw's legacy was the roller coaster at Thorpe Park. Now... maybe things could be back on track. It hasn't redeemed the franchise; the usual bad acting, logic gaps and lack of genuine scares still applies. But at the same time, this installment prioritizes thought provoking moral themes and tension over gore and flashbacks and it is an intense, unsettling experience. With

memorable death scenes, a reasonable amount of tension and a relatively solid plot, this should be satisfying enough to most. It doesn't entirely feel like Saw since virtually no-one, not even those still alive, returns from the previous films and the grimy, unclean atmosphere of the old films is replaced by a cleaner, more high-tech vibe, but many will like the various nods to the past movies.

6/10

9

Very enjoyable saw movie with more backstory. Kinda funny at times but still just as sick and twisted with plenty of blood and guts. You gotta love the bucket heads, an instant saw classic trap. Ending was mind blowing as always and I'm glad to see saw going back to it's roots. Can't wait to see where this new trilogy will go. If you have seen the first seven saw films you definitely have to see this one!

6

It would be totally fine if SAW franchise had ended at the 7th installment, however, I don't mind that there's a new one, let's break down why

Jigsaw is the 8th installment, and surprisingly, it's not that bad, but it's kind of unnecessary and doesn't feel warranted

It does have it's positives

They have changed some things especially the visual style. When the trailer came out, i was disappointed that they had done away the gritty look of the previous SAW films and are bringing a new cleaner visual style that felt a little less scary but after watching the film, i have to say, the visual style is a breathe of fresh air and a nice change up

Another good thing is that the film focuses less on the torture porn aspect and instead it focuses more on solving the puzzle aspect of the traps. They have toned down the violence, but i'm okay with that because they did focus on making the traps more of a challenge instead of a torture. But if we talk about the traps, yes there were a very few maybe one or two original and innovative traps but the rest were very uninspired and a less gore-y versions of some traps from previous SAW films

The film does have a cool and unexpected turn of events. There's an interesting mystery going on and an intriguing 'whodunnit' story line that keeps you guessing

Let's get down to negatives

I know that the directors of this film, Spierig brothers are good at their jobs and they know how to make a film and i really liked their previous film that was Predestination but here, even though they showed that they understood the basis and core aspects of SAW franchise, they could not manage to deliver anything too impressive or anything we haven't seen before except the overall change of tone and visual style

The writing is mediocre, but like i said it does have some cool twists

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

that you may not see coming, it still is very cliché and mediocre. Like always, there is excessive use of flashbacks to tell many parts of the story, which may not be a negative but excessive use is excessive and can be considered lazy at times

I've seen critics mentioning the cringe-y acting and i agree that in many scenes, some acting is very over the top and a bit cringe-y

Wrapping up the review, i would say, Jigsaw is not as good as it could have been but its not the worst of the franchise. In fact, it may be like the 4th or 5th best film in the SAW series if i had to rank them in terms of quality

I do appreciate that Jigsaw combines some of the best ideas of some SAW films and delivers some good moments but it barely does anything to justify its existence beyond making more money for the franchise

If you like most of the SAW films, you may enjoy this one too. Even if you only like the first few SAW films, i would say give this a chance if you want to, you may end up liking it. It's an easy watch with a small run time that doesn't drag too much and it's very fast paced.

i would give it 6/10

6

This one upset me. This was the most engaging saw film since 1. Loved the detective/crime story as usual and FOR ONCE I wasn't subjected to just gory nonsense. It's a bit gruesome and grisly due to the morgue photos and dead bodies - oh yes there was blood - but they saved the big gore till the end as a payoff. Loved it up until the end where it all falls apart.

The ending itself was stupid. I would have laughed at the killers final line (it's so PATHETIC compared to saw 1's 'game over') but I was sitting there with jaw on the floor from how BAD the ending was. Ruined everything. I even forgave the lapses in logic cuz it's saw and when saw is good - it's fun. I thought the traps were well done and the silo trap was the best since maybe the shotgun tilt a whirl of 6. Too many things unanswered, some missing characters...

SPOILERS

I thought the main chick was gonna be Jeff's daughter - and she wasn't so I was really upset about that lol When the killer is revealed I was dumbfounded... I liked the cast a lot and thought it was well written on the whole but just all comes apart at the reveal. Tobin's scene was great - the highlight of the movie. I guessed that the game had already happened - seemed obvious right?

What happened to Ella(?) and what happened to one leg guy? I thought tobin was dr. gordon at first - then I remembered it already happened - but where is he? Where's Hoffman? I loved the cancer diagnosis angle - that was great but I was really hoping we'd find out her last name was Denlan. I ended my fan edit of all films in one long ass movie with the 'don't trust the one who saves you' part... I really thought that was where they were gonna go - with Jeff's daughter...oh well.

END OF

SPOILERS

In the end they got a lot right but the wrong ruined what was the best

one (maybe 3rd best) after the original. Really disappointed and I have no idea how to include it my fan edit cuz it almost seems insulting to put it in cuz it has nothing to do with series almost. A real WASTE of a good ride.

I think the blade on this saw has finally dulled - this new direction

just seems like it will ruin the original series. That's what's SO maddening about this movie - I loved it until the end. It was MORE than making up for the unwatchable POS that was 7.

So can I say watch it? Yeah but it will disappoint you but the ride is

worthy enough if we still had videos stores. "Watch when it comes on TV" is vague and it sounds stupid. Wait for it on video was always an easy good review lol

I'd rank the films from best to last -

Saw (4 stars - a classic in it's own way) Saw VI (4 stars - great sequel) Saw IV (3 1/2 stars. Best twist in the series. best misdirection) Saw III (3 1/2 stars - it's just SO bloody and mean and nasty. A real mean spirited movie) Saw II (3 stars - good sequel. still fun)

Saw V (**1/2) I like it but only works as a piece and not it's own movie) Jigsaw (** stars) Almost best since original - terrible ending) Saw VII - utter trash. Used about 12 mins of it in my edit lol

Peace.

6

I am in a unique position because I would not have chosen to go and see this movie. I was invited to it for a friends birthday, I can give you my honest opinion with no prior experience\expectations with the franchise.

Not once did I feel I was missing out having not knowing the series, As

a stand alone movie it did well misdirecting suspicion in some parts. However in a lot of movie I found myself telegraphing what was going to happen and knowing what was there for a second viewing which I like to be in the dark for until the second time round. I can forgive this cause there won't be a next time. The people I was with all said the same thing... "The first was the best, and the movies went downhill until this one."

The acting was good the effects were better.

However, the twist at the end was a masterpiece I will give it that. No one could have seen that coming.

10

I was very excited when the first jigsaw trailer was online and my hopes were extremely high. When the film premiered I immediately went to see it and my god I was mind blown by the plot and characters. Like previous saw films the story is some what the same with a few added twist to each characters background. The puppet looks very awesome with new features added and Tobin bell still does the voice of him which was very amazing. I finally happy to see films like this getting back to

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

what the term HORROR is frankly there hasn't been any good horror films that were great. Mainly nowadays horror films tend to be your typical tacky cliché; jumpscare gimmick with annoying loud banging sound and mainly focusing on cheap demon/ ghost filth & the conjuring, the babadook, bye bye man, ouija, sinister, oculus, paranormal activity and those dreadful insidious films. Finally horror movies are getting back to its roots of pure horror because humans are the one that you should be scared.

6

There will be spoilers in the last paragraph.

When I saw the first trailer I was stoked on seeing it first. Now that I've seen it, it brought some pretty disappointing moments where I wanted the series to be changed.

First off I wanted to see more unanswered plot holes from Saw The Final Chapter like why some people were involved and stuff. Second, I thought they would be adding more modern technology in the mix. Third, I expected a whole new feeling to the film that was different from the others. Finally fourth, I wanted Waaaaay more mystery and drama.

Although this film didn't meet my expectations it's still ranking 3 out of all the saw movies. There was nothing new and if they are to make a sequel they better add something new to the series. I gave it a 6/10 for it's come back to the series, it's new traps, and it's twist I SAW coming. We need a new Jig from the series c'mon!

!SPOILER! I easily saw 2/3rds of the plot coming when they first mentioned the spiral trap and the rumor he used it before every other one of his victims. Also I knew it was that dude who faked him dying by the lasers because we've seen it before in Saw 1, also because they found skin sampled in his freezer. Ultimately the twist was pretty easy to see. Sorry to bring your hopes down but they should've left it Saw: Legacy and made JIGSAW a new, brighter, more innovative movie after.

10

I'm a huge fan of the Saw franchise & I never saw this coming a Prequel and a Sequel all rolled into one, my mind is blown away. Jigsaw is brilliantly written as they all are, the traps are especially good & the twist was incredible & spoiler coming; that we were watching a prequel game all along! and the reveal of Jigsaw so we think he's alive! my jaw was on the floor! the 7 years has been worth the wait as Jigsaw exceeded my expectation.

6

I agree that JIGSAW is an unnecessary sequel in the SAW franchise, but

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

if I'm honest the whole series has been unnecessary, aside from the first movie. This one's a densely-plotted lukewarm rehash of previous sequels and ideas, with five characters engaging in more against-the-clock deadly traps while the detectives on the outside attempt to figure out whether the killer Jigsaw really is back and on the prowl again.

As with the sequels, this is pretty confusing stuff although it all

makes sense towards the end, although I wasn't all that convinced by some of the twists. An aged Tobin Bell returns to his role (thanks to one of the aforementioned twists) and is a welcome presence, and the traps are gruesome and nasty, although not the most inventive of the franchise. All together, this is acceptable fare, although not a film you'll want to bother revisiting.

6

The Saw franchise went downhill since the original back in 2004. Though it was assumed to have ended in 2010, another sequel has arrived seven years later. My main concern with this was the fact that it was probably going to end up being another film that's made for fans of violence and gore, who enjoy this series just for the traps and who makes it out alive. While Jigsaw is exactly that, there are many more layers to this film than I was expecting, making for a somewhat enjoyable viewing experience. I won't be recommending this movie to anyone who has never seen a previous installment, nor will I recommend it to those who have and have disliked it from the beginning. Jigsaw isn't going to win any new fans over, but in terms of popcorn horror entertainment, I think you can still do much worse than Jigsaw. It tries very hard to please hardcore fans, and I truly believe that it does so. This really isn't all that great of a movie, but let's dive into why it's better than it deserves to be.

Like always, you follow the police as they try to solve the mystery of the ongoing puzzle so that they can try and save as many lives as possible. These films exist for their traps nowadays, but I have to give credit where credit is due and offer some applause to the neat little twists this movie pulls off throughout its final act. Like most of these sequels, the twists are too little and too late, but you can tell that the writers care about trying to give the audience a little more than just killing people in inventive ways.

The characters throughout this film receive some backstory, but that's also the biggest issue I had with this movie as a whole. Looking back on it, I appreciate the fact that each of the characters throughout the core game was fleshed out more than I was expecting them to be, but they honestly make you hate every one of the players, which was a huge distraction from me, having absolutely nobody to root for. Yes, the majority of these movies are like that, but there was always someone to latch onto, hoping they would make it out alive. Instead, we receive a slew of characters that have all made terrible decisions in the past,

forcing you to slightly be okay with what the killer is doing to them.

Although I didn't care about any of the characters, Jigsaw found a way to win me over in the end, with a few very clever reveals, making the characters themselves seem less relevant anyway. You don't go into a Saw movie to see fleshed out characters, but when a movie can ground itself and invest you even in the slightest, points can be given for that. The character of John Kramer is the character who's fleshed out the most here, giving a small, but detailed level to the franchise itself, which was quite the surprise for me.

The deaths themselves are pretty impressive in terms of being memorable because everything from Saw IV to Saw VII is a complete blur to me. I'll be remembering some of the set pieces when looking back on Jigsaw and that's easily more than I was able to say about most of the sequels that this franchise has offered through the years. There are nods to previous deaths throughout some of the games and there's definitely a reason behind that, which makes it worth waiting until the end.

Overall, like I said, Jigsaw won't win over any new viewers, but fans of the franchise will be able to appreciate the cleverness that it has to offer when it ties itself into the timeline of the series. The dialogue is very generic, the story itself isn't anything you haven't already seen, and the characters are extremely forgettable. That being said, the traps are fun, the conclusion is satisfying for those who have followed the series from the beginning, and the spirit of the original is still present enough to warrant a recommendation for hardcore fans. Jigsaw works for what it sets out to achieve, but it's still the same old schtick. I had a fun time with this movie because I've seen every other film in the franchise and I still found this one of the best. It's really not that bad in retrospect.

8

So it has been a long time since a Saw film came out but this was certainly worth the wait. Jigsaw is not very scary but it isn't trying to be. It is a smart and fun entry that modernizes the Saw franchise. It was REALLY cool to see Tobin Bell on the big screen again, like that guy is so freakin cool! The characters range from cool to not cool, but the worst character is the one who survives! It's the person you wanted to see die the most, yet he walks out A-OKAY. These Saw movies have a knack for doing that! The gore in this movie is INCREDIBLE and features downright the BEST gore moment of the entire Saw franchise, where a guy's head is split down the middle like an apple slicer. It had me cheering, because it is not only the best gore moment in the entire Saw franchise but one of the best gory moments I've ever seen in theaters! The twist at the end sent chills down my spine, like wow I never would've guessed it and it made so much sense too. I was so happy this film was good. I would probably rank it in fourth place behind Saw 1, 2, and 3, and it ties with Saw 6. I would recommend you buy a ticket

tonight!

4

Hollywood's cash cow advantage for Halloween. The traps were meh. Too tamed compared to other saw movies. The twist at the end was awful nearly the whole movie turns out to be one big flashback. Flashbacks are starting to become an annoying cliché; both in movies and TV series. It's a sequel that didn't need to be made. I recommend not bothering with this one.

8

REVIEW - JIGSAW

Who remembers the very first Saw film and how through the course of the many films the whole premise seemed to get lost to the investigation.

The premise that it was a game with an outcome you could choose.

In many ways this latest installment returns to the original premise but.....

Generally a good (not great) film but certainly worth your time.

One or two plot holes which of course I will not give away.

My biggest problem with the film is why? As with Ghost In The Machine, why tell us the complete story in one film, why not leave us wanting more?

The above doesn't generally spoil the film which does have a lot of twists and turns.

Rating 8 out of 10

7

I saw Jigsaw, starring Tobin Bell-24_tv, The Quick and the Dead; Matt Passmore-The Glades_tv, Son of the Mask; Callum Keith Rennie-Longmire_tv, Fifty Shades of Grey and Laura Vandervoort-Ted, Smallville_tv. This is the 8th movie in the 'Saw' franchise and yes, I know, the last one back in 2010 was called the final chapter but he's back-you just can't keep a good man down. This is the first Saw movie that has the character's name, Jigsaw, in the title. What is remarkable to me is that Jigsaw/Tobin was killed off in the third Saw movie but the producers keep coming up with ways for him to make an appearance-and yes, they have an explanation here, too. This one starts with bodies turning up dead and all the evidence points to one man as being responsible, Tobin. Callum is the lucky policeman that gets to try and match wits with Tobin. Matt plays the medical examiner that gets to autopsy all the dead bodies showing up-and some of them are in pretty bad shape. Laura is one of the lucky contestants that gets to play Tobin's games, and yes, they are just as gruesome as always. Now I know that these movies are not for everyone-my wife hates them-but if you do like them, then you will probably enjoy this one, too. I know I did. It's rated R for grisly bloody violence, torture and language and has a running time of 1 hour & 31 minutes. I enjoyed it and would

buy it on DVD.

10

The best horror movie in the world with this section as well he showed me that he was still brilliant. The story is well designed, a sight is a flawless point as we like :) I have no idea how much idiot critic instead of shutting down everything why they do not settle down movie? I find it outrageous to get rid of movies that are not should.

5

So,tonight Jigsaw premiered in my cinema and for some reason,the cinema room was empty,so,that was OK,I was alone. The film followed the story of another guilty bunch who are pursued in to a game of grisly games as the new killer may actually be Jigsaw himself,yes,Jigsaw. So,I actually kind of wished I did not have to see this,I had already gone on a big shopping spree with my family,surprising me due to it being my birthday and afterwards,I was wrecked..but,for you guys,I saw it! The opening scene in Jigsaw made me actually wanna fall asleep,I was really tired but sat through the whole thing and was it worth it..not really. I kind of wished to be honest,I did not see Jigsaw,wasting money on myself,the film was just another crappy Saw film,well,not too crappy. Jigsaw was not really all that bad,I thought the traps though were kind of poor having it have the exact same kind of theme of traps to Saw V,one thing though I did love about this film was the ending that really had me like..what?! I wont spoil,but it was a brilliant ending,the acting in the film was OK,something that was weird was the setting,I felt also that this was not even a Saw film,when you think about the first seven having been set in old dungeons and stuff,this had barley any resemblance to it which is something that I admired,the actual very ending to the film was OK with that trap at the end being definitely crap,I mean,like there's bad traps,but the laser one..OH MY GOD!! Jigsaw is a mixed sequel with good things and bad things but at the end of the day,will Saw ever change?

6

From 2004 to 2010, we were greeted with a Saw film once every Halloween. Each film built on the foundation of the previous film, literally deeming them as iterations of one another. Now that time has past between films and new films and ideas have come out since then in the torture porn genre (I hate using that phrase, especially to describe the first film), new ground had to be broken. There are die-hard Saw fans like myself who know most every little intricacy of the first seven films, but nobody cares about the old formula anymore. It tired itself out. Instead of reiterating, it was now time to innovate. Enter co-writers Josh Stolberg & Pete Goldfinger and co-directors

Michael & Peter Spierig, and in Halloween of 2017 you get Jigsaw.

All of this follows an eerily similar path to the Jurassic Park franchise. JP had sequels that, while in-name they hold their own, after a while started turn away some moviegoers and even got close to jumping the shark if it continued down the beaten path. So they created some space between themselves for some years, and came back with a re-branding. Both films (Jigsaw and Jurassic World) serve as standalone films if you so want to treat them as such or jump into them anew, play off their respective first films in terms of content and paying proper homage, modernize themselves and play more to a general casual audience (Jigsaw domestically, JW globally), can and probably will churn out its own set of sequels, and let veterans of the franchises appreciate the small bits that played off any one of the previous installments. Jurassic World lives in a PG-13 setting though and caved in to more Hollywood tropes (including CGI), plus is a much higher budget film, but Jigsaw still breaks a lot of new ground that will not play familiarly to the Saw films of old.

When Darren Lynn Bousman jumped on board to direct Saw II, he noted in the commentary track what some of the 'staples' were for the franchise, including quick-cuts. While I don't agree with that assessment, this continued for his next two films in the franchise, and directors David Hackl and Kevin Greutert followed up with a similar format. The films also found themselves in flashback haven, remained almost exclusively within interior settings, and centralized a set of characters to connect within a small universe. Jigsaw opens up to the feeling that this is taking place in a larger city and environment, letting characters in and out of the games explore more and be realer people (in that they do not just serve the purpose of the film alone, like they have lives outside of what we see). The framing of the film has changed, the color palette has widened, Charlie Clouser's score is not as in-your-face, and the production simply doesn't feel as cheap. Right steps were made in making this film much more accessible, and I see this continuing in the future.

While Jurassic World actually seems to remove the sequels from canon (we will see if that's true with Jeff Goldblum's appearance in Fallen Kingdom), Jigsaw plays strongly in the sense that if you go without seeing, recalling, or keeping in mind Saw 4-7, you will be okay. Hoffman is completely out of the picture in Jigsaw, never once mentioned or concerned about. The only traits to be aware of in those films was that John lost a child, was once in a relationship with Jill Tuck, and there was an autopsy performed on his body. In fact, you could just as easily disregard specifics about Saw II and Saw III, and you will probably be okay. Knowing that John Kramer was killed in the third film just might be enough.

This one really mostly plays off the first film to be most effective, though. Aside from the elaborateness of the traps and games being made (which could transition more smoothly seeing the other seven films first), we can leave the first film understanding that a cancer-

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

stricken individual puts victims in life-or-death scenarios because of moral sins they have committed, and if killed get a puzzle piece cut out of their bodies. Seasoned individuals will also find some of the twists in the new film somewhat predictable simply because they know how Jigsaw thinks (or really, how the writers think). There were over a half-dozen twists, and I probably guessed or suspected the majority of them. Didn't make the film any inferior because I'm sitting and thinking about the casual moviegoer experiencing this film, and I think the best thing you can do for yourself now is at least see the first film and heck even at most know the outcome of the original trilogy. Saw IV, V, VI and The Final Chapter now all end up being fan-service flicks, unless any Jigsaw sequels end up coming back to them more than they have now.

I liked this movie. It could've been a complete garbage escapade like the seventh film was, and it wasn't. This reignites the franchise after it had stalled out and breathes fresh air. Maybe we will get a couple more within the next few Halloweens, because there is something to explore but I don't know how they'll want to do it. It is up to their creative bones now, and I like that facet of it because they can make good films if they try their darnedest in doing so.

If this film interests you enough that you want to give the first film a chance and haven't yet, go to Netflix right now to check it out, consider completing the original trilogy if you loved it enough to see what happens next, and check out this film when you're able to. I've reached my 1000-word limit, so now I'll just leave you here with my franchise ranking:

1, 3, 6, 2, J, 5, 4, 7

6

For me the best thing about sequel is the unity. Each one of them complete the others missing parts. This one is totally apart from the rest

About movie, thriller wasn't enough, traps wasn't excited, spilled blood wasn't enough.

Storyline seem like rushed, was weak. I expected much more. Was disappointing for me.

At the end i waited for "Game over" with shutted door. At least don't take it away from me right. But they did.

Worst one of the sequel for me . Sorry about that. It is disgrace for John's legacy.

By the way Laura Vandervoort your color is the brown thrust me "3";3

1

Worst hour and a half of my life. That's all that needs to be said but since IMDb requires you to write 5 lines in a review I'll explain why. Firstly, it was horrible. I didn't find it thrilling at any point and the story line was just confusing and not good. I definitely could of

written a better movie when I was in grade 3.

9

Even though people rarely admit it, the 'Saw' series has been one of the highest quality horror series ever made. 'Jigsaw' is the eighth entry in the series and there is still yet to be a bad film made amongst them. Some are undoubtedly better than others, but I defy you to point me out one that is inherently bad. I also defy you to show me another horror series (even any type of series at all is rare) that has maintained quality across that many films. That's why I was so happy that 'Jigsaw' was a brilliant movie, because if they had come back seven years later only to put forward a bad film for the sake of making money it would have ruined everything. Luckily that was not the case though.

While this one does follow the formula used in all the past films, it also feels quite unique in a number of ways. The original seven films were all set within a very tight time-frame. This one of course is pushing ten years into the future. This adds layers of intrigue to the proceedings, because how could 'Jigsaw' be committing these crimes when he died all those years back? And you just know they're going to have a brilliant answer to that question.

As far as the traps go in this one, I'm not too sure how I feel. None of them were bad, however none of them really blew me away either. My favourite one (without giving away any spoilers) was actually the most simple one in the film involving a gun. The psychology behind that one is what I loved. I love when these films aren't afraid to be intelligent.

The twist in this one also caught me completely off-guard. I've heard people say they weren't entirely convinced by it and felt that the film cheated, however I disagree. Nothing is off limits coming in a 'Saw' movie. You have to know that going in. Altogether I absolutely loved this film and would thoroughly recommend it to anyone who is in anyway interested in the genre.

6

Saw has had many ups and downs as a series. The 'final chapter' in 2010 was about as limp as soggy bread, giving us nothing shocking and a long-expected twist.

Jigsaw begins anew (don't expect Hoffman or Dr. Gordon to return) and features new characters and a new set of games. But...how can this be if John Kramer died over ten years ago? Is he really dead? He has to be. Right?

There are definite improvements here. The cinematography and production design is light years beyond the previous movies. I used to refer to Saw having 'faketography' with some of the rudest, ugliest, and cheapest filters and color corrections ever to dirty the big screen. Jigsaw, being the first to be shot in 2.35:1, actually looks cinematic

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

and it's the film's best feature. The games and traps themselves are gruesome but not overplayed, which took the focus away from torture porn and gave it a bit more of the psychological edge we got in the first movie.

Sadly, it fails elsewhere. The story gives us YET MORE cops, YET MORE

coroners, and YET MORE doctors (all of them forgettable) filling up the side story. Sorry, but after a seven-year hiatus this should have been more unique and subversive. I gotta admit though, that twist ending had me kicking myself, and Charlie Clouser's score is as intense as ever.

Not a bad film, but not the huge comeback it should have been. I rank it somewhere in the middle of the series overall.

10

What can I say? As a huge SAW fan I was so exited for this movie. It didn't disappoint me at all! Great actors, great traps, gorgeous music.. And last but not least, a thrilling story and spine-chilling feeling through the whole movie! A golden comeback for the franchise! Great job Lionsgate!

5

I love the Saw movies don't get me wrong, but this movie although it was filmed very well and even had its funny cool moments just seemed like a repeat of something that was already seen. Do not get me wrong I loved seeing the new torture devices, but to see how each of them died and it ended up with no one winning, but finding out Jigsaw saved and trained another person seemed very predictable and overrated. I think this movie would have been awesome if turned out Jigsaw did not actually die and came back with an even more serious vengeance and did not give people a chance, but killed them in his own selective way and the last one to survive had a chance to save their own life. As far as the ending for this movie I thought was predictable and repeated. This movie could have been so much better.

10

Of course, its not my favorite part of this fantastic movie, BUT! I think everybody knows, that a lot of movies which has continuation, becoming more and more boring part by part. For example Pirates of Caribbean sea. i don't so like first 35m of movie. I saw it few hours ago, and at first 35 m i was thinking that - Oh no, please, lets something happen, because i have feeling, that it will be another movie, which makes me boring after his older parts, but this part, i can say, that makes me feel, what i was feeling after first, second and sixth parts... when you are starting to think after the end of movie.... and for me this is one of the best continuation parts i have ever seen. Sure, there are a lot of not logical moments, but steel, for 8th part its brilliant work. Please make 9th part

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

better...make Cramer alive,because you open that idea in 8th part....thank you for not boring continuation.

3

Right I am a big fan of this franchise... A real big fan so that when I was at the school I even made a film that is inspired by the franchise... Even though I am not proud of the film considering it was tight on budget and time Eventually it was shown at numerous film festivals around the world because it was catchy, commercial and current...

So last week after seeing Jigsaw I was shocked to see my plot being turned into feature length script,shot and presented to me in the cinema...

Some might call this as plot similarity which I doubt... As even the writers made the same mistakes as I did... (Those flat characters in Jigsaw... In a short film I had limited time to establish a character anyway)

Secondly Both mine and Jigsaw twists the time... Which is the main similarity... Which means the bodywork of the films are literally the SAME...

Second thing to note is at first those bucket heads did not mean a lot to me... Why they were there to begin with... Until I spot the first similarity about the plot...

Literally my work is inspired from ice bucket challenge... So you now know where those bucket heads are coming from...

Interesting coincidence one might even doubt if it is a coincidence or an indirect COPY & PASTE product...

you can check my short on youtube under Game Of Death Terms & Conditions short film if you are a writer it would be easy for you to understand the similarities...

let me know what you think...

9

This saw movie was actually one of the best ones. This movie had its scary moments and its funny moments, I give it a 9/10 because i have been waiting for a long time, I actually got to learn what happened after all these years but disappointing because Gordon and Hoffman weren't revealed. We still don't know what happened to them :(

9

If you love horror/thriller type of movies you must have seen at least one of Saw movies. It's been 7 years since the last Saw movie and with this one Jigsaw makes a great comeback. Like all Saw movies this one is also tied with the other ones and also gives you a new perspective about the previous ones. The plot looks simple at first. Looking like a classic John Kramer game where he wants justice and trying to teach a lesson to his chosen players. But as the movie continues it gets more complicated and it keeps you on the edge of your seat which is great.

And as we get to climax part of the movie the legendary Saw music starts playing and all of the things that you are confused about is explained and you're just left with an open mouth. Because the plot twist is really good and a clever one. So i think this is a really must see!!

6

Tyler Perry is something of an American phenomenon; a one-man motion picture industry. As a director, writer, or producer; and frequently all three; Perry since 2005 has been responsible for some twenty remarkably successful motion pictures. And that's in addition to the pictures of other filmmakers in which Perry has appeared only as an actor; popular films such as Star Trek, Alex Cross, and Gone Girl. To date, nine of Tyler Perry's twenty pictures as a producer, writer, or director have featured the character Madea, a plain-spoken and tough- loving elderly woman with a nurturing heart, a highly-acute antenna for the difference between right and wrong, and a penchant for involving herself in the troubles of other people. Madea, who's played in elaborate makeup and costuming by Perry himself, is based in equal measures upon the filmmaker's mother and aunt, and is partially inspired by the characterizations and performances by comic Eddie Murphy in the 2000 comedy The Nutty Professor II. Tyler Perry's comedies are remarkably accessible to filmgoing audiences. While the motion pictures of other filmmaking multi-taskers often appeal to an especially exclusive and rarefied demographic; Woody Allen springs to mind; Perry's movies are popular entertainment for anyone who loves to laugh. Unfortunately, Boo 2! is not among Perry's best pictures; or even among his best Madea pictures. While the laughs are there, especially for Perry's legions of fans and Madea aficionados, they're more sparse than usual, and less frequent. Both the filmmaker and the character he created seem to be going through the motions by rote, and without heart. Boo 2! is enjoyable enough. But audiences unfamiliar with Tyler Perry or Madea might find themselves wondering what all the fuss is about.

6

Hellur! Tyler Perry's signature character has made her mark for so many years, teaching lessons in her own unique manner. These movies have come in all sorts of scenarios, many being close carbon copies of the predecessors that laid the foundation. This series continues to rope loyal fans into the theater though, never tiring of the gimmicks cooked up at Perry Studios. Tonight, the sequel to Madea's Halloween tale emerges, in hopes of mimicking the success it brought not long ago. What's the verdict? Robbie K, here asking you to read on to find out

his opinions.

LIKES:

Familiarity: When it comes to Madea, you don't expect much deviation from the formula, a comforting factor indeed. Perry's writing doesn't try to be anything it's not, and that nets some respect in bringing the laughs that make so many laugh. And if you're a fan of this series, you'll have nothing to fear in regards to the comedy at hand (as evidenced by many people howling with laughter in my showing.)

Plenty of Madea: Some Madea movies don't do give the mad lady her adequate screen time, choosing instead to go for a more drama (soap opera like) plot. Boo 2 is more than happy to give you a Madea fix, with much of the 100-minute run time staying on our "protagonist." She leads much of the banter, and her insults are more than enough to keep things engaging alongside her older colleagues. So, for a movie promising Madea, this film delivers on this aspect as well.

Fast Pace: Another positive for Boo 2 is that the movie doesn't dawdle when it comes to getting to the laughs. A small, simplistic opening makes way to the comedy at hand, taking less than 20 minutes to get to the first bout of Madea running her mouth. Once that first joke flies, the movie continues at a steady pace and creating the effect of time flying (seriously had no idea an hour had passed). This leads to an entertaining environment that is simply fun on many levels, that's right no complicated thinking in this film.

Joe: By far the best part of the movie for me is Madea's brother Joe. While his sexually harsh jokes, lack of respect for others, and intense focus on drugs are not my main source of humor, this character has some of the best comedic moments of the movie. His timing is well- executed, and his lines are just harsh enough to offset the bickering this movie holds within. The piece de resistance though, is how well Perry delivers that gruff edge in his humor to maximize the punch of the line and keep the laughs fresh. I found myself laughing the most with his scenes and was glad to see more Joe in this film.

DISLIKES:

Unoriginal: Familiarity is fun and entertaining, but it is also lacking the original twist I like to see in the films. Every Madea film has a slight twist to it, but this film is too much a copy of the first Halloween movie that the tactics are fairly stale. Had it not been for the comedic timing at some parts of the movie, the bantering would have gotten much staler as the old folks complained about the same things consistently. This dislike also goes to the fact that Madea's jokes are losing favor with me, especially when they drop the morals for incoherent babbling and arguing.

The College Kids: If you read my last Madea review, you know the college kids didn't impress me. Sadly, this movie managed to make me loathe these characters even more. Rather than giving the younger characters some admirable qualities, outside of superficial looks, Perry crafted them to be the same, shallow, annoying selves they were in the past, only much worse. The fraternity brother are even hornier, stupid meatheads with little contribution to the movie. Leah (Lexy

Panterra) is reduced to a squabbling airhead, who does little, but flash off her own body with overacted gestures and a skin-tight leopard shirt. Yet, the worst character goes to Tiffany (Diamond White) the arrogant brat who supposedly learned her lesson last time. After all the punishing blows, the hotheaded teen hasn't learned a thing and has fallen back into the same annoying qualities I despised in the first film. What's even more pathetic, is that they don't use her selfishness very well to drive a moral filled plot, but just as a tool for more jokes. Sadly, this movie doesn't give the satisfying punch that its predecessor accomplished.

No story: Boo 2's other major dislike for me is that lack of a story. It's true, the movie runs at a quick pace and is entertaining, but the trailers have tricked you into thinking there is a story. This particular Madea story is the lamest story of the bunch, with only a hair thin plot to ground the comedy too. Past this skeletal frame, the movie is only about cramming the most jokes into the run time, which also took away from the Madea formula.

The VERDICT:

Boo 2 is a sequel that accomplishes the goal of making you laugh with the same familiar tactics Perry has capitalized on for the last decade. It's simple fun, fast paced humor will keep fans howling in delight, while also welcoming a new age in with its simplicity. Yet, I found this movie to be the weakest of the installments, particularly due to the unbalanced characters and lack of story to guide the mischief better. Safe to say this movie is meant for home viewing pleasure where you can enjoy the banter and insults with better snacks and bathroom privileges.

My scores:

Comedy/Horror: 7.0 Movie Overall: 5.0

6

While the first. Madea boo offered a decent amount of laughs but I found the sequel to be somewhat lacking, while the movie features the return of fan favorites Madea, Joe, Bam and Hattie Mae but it felt like the similar tone of the first despite being the tenth Madea film. Brian's ex wife Deborah makes a return appearance since diary of a mad black woman, but played by a different actress.

2

I would have loved it if the prank was for real. How Madea would react when scared for real.

What I didn't like : 1. Joe is too much and is no longer funny.

The teenager with her friend, were very boring.

The whole movie was disappointing.

The turn around of the ex wife was very not genuine. I would have loved to have seen more drama on that and also when Perry heard that his ex allowed the daughter to go for a party, I have loved Tyler not to be part of the prank and also Tyler not to let the daughter go easy. Bottom line drama was not there and the bit that was there was not interesting.

1

OK, when are people who think Madea is funny going to wake up and see this is just a bad story, writing, directing and acting all in one movie. I would have preferred to watch 10 hours straight of PBS, just so I can get back whatever brain cells were sucked out while having to sit through this debacle. It was not funny!! The actors were one dimensional. The jokes were either sexist or racist. The plot was stupid. Take my advice, stay away from Perry's movies. He has become one of the bloated, bad directors that Hollywood should be ashamed of and they should be ashamed for ever making these types of movies. With so many good choices in steaming, cable and other movies it is hard to believe people would go to this heap of a movie. By the way, the only reason we went is we got free passes and it was still a rip off!!

3

Concur with other reviewers! Definitely not worth paying full price for. If it wasn't Tyler Perry, I would believe it was just a money grab?? Oddly, my family and many of the audience laughed a lot but not his best work and not half as funny as original. Even Hattie couldn't save this one, sniff sniff

2

This was not his best, even earlier ones, Father's straying to profanity and vulgar, adults left early and families with kids met us in the lobby. Tone it down and balance the racial references. Disappointed at this one. Maby this was the one too many with same line, two new characters added did not fit. Fresh dialog and tone down Father. Summary, We will still support he and his characters.

5

So as far as sequels go, this is a very typical one. I went to see Boo 2 because though Tyler Perry movies are not really my thing, I actually enjoyed the first Boo, so I took the chance that I would enjoy the second one. I totally did, too. It's not as good as the original. As much as I found the original funny, it also had an attempt to show family values in it that was not lost on me. This time around their attempt (If there was one cause I did not see it) was literally taken out to make more room for laughs. In a lot of ways it made the film like the second episode of one of Perry's shows (Which I like more than his movies), as it seems nobody learned the lesson from the first Madea Halloween. Case in point, like the original, Boo 2 is about Joe trying to discipline his entitled daughter, Tiffany. Once again she defies her

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

overbearing father's wishes in order to go to a party at midnight in the woods at a camp where a bunch of people got murdered. Now I understand the natural urge for a teenager not to want to listen to her dad, but when your aunt is someone like Madea, you would think you would think twice about this woman coming to track you down, especially after what happen in the last movie.

Like the last film, Boo 2 focuses on Madea and her friends running into terror and danger while trying to get to Tiffany. The film likes to Parody current themes in horror like with influences of Korean horror and it also pokes a nod to old school Horror with the film taking place at a camp and the underage teens being hunted by a man with a mask and a chainsaw.

Overall, I much prefer the more light hearted Tyler Perry movies. Sometimes his stuff can be too over dramatic for me, but I seem to like it when he goes for straight up Sitcom style on us and that's Boo 2!

It's crazy and filled with laughs and no matter where it fails compare to the first one, we are there to laugh and that's what makes this sequel enjoyable.

<http://cinemagardens.com/?p=1756>

1

Firstest of all DA haters can just get shook off. #shakeemoff

Tyler Perry is both DA funniest man and woman simultaneously in dis film y'all.

I was luffing so hard i almost choked on mu popcorn yo but also dis movie is also Hakka scurry yo, Dem jump scares had me like "oh snap" but Madea handled DAT stuff, yo go girl and den also you give it up to DA jay man in the sky #blessesed

i hope they make 8 mo sequels because dis was tight.

Mr.Perry this is the fan base you appeal to, At very least this is what you imagine the mindset of your audience to be.

Your films are modern day minstrel shows and as Madea you personify every negative stereotype that exists in black culture. Nothing about what you do or say is even remotely funny.

I wonder on occasion if through the piles of cash and the turbid veil of Hollywood, If you take the time to look at yourself in the mirror before you inevitably shuck and jive your way through another film.

3

Let me just say that for the record, I'm not a Madea fan, I am just a casual moviegoer. But that doesn't mean I can't get enjoyment out of these movies.

Last year, I saw Boo! A Madea Halloween. I thought it was okay. Sure, some of the comedy scenes dragged on and on and there were some stupid

moments, but I overall thought it was an alright movie. I thought it was way better than the other comedy I saw that year, Why Him.

But one year later, we get this movie. Hoo boy.

Now, when I heard that they were making ANOTHER Madea Halloween movie one year after they already did one, I thought to myself, "Why? Didn't they just do one?" But then, I was like, "Whatever. Maybe something new is in store."

When I heard the plot of this movie, I thought it sounded like the laziest sequel ever.

When I saw the movie, I was right.

I did not enjoy this film. The plot was the SAME EXACT THING as the last film. (Spoiler alert) That teenage girl goes to yet ANOTHER party with those frat guys, somehow not learning her lesson from last time, and surprise surprise, something supernatural happens. How lazy and uninspired can you get? Oh, and if you weren't there for the first Halloween movie, don't worry. The characters will be happy to mention it constantly. And just like the last film, some scenes with Madea and her friends talking drag. But it's shorter this time around. That's good. Some parts of this movie were stale, like a lot of scenes featured the same thing happening: Madea and the gang are in their car and something jumps out at them and scares them. Rinse and repeat. A lot of the characters got really annoying, especially Madea's brother, Joe, who I swear, always had something to say whenever a sentence was uttered. Further contributing to the film's laziness, the moral (if you will) from Boo 1 was the same, but it was with the mom instead of the dad. It wasn't really built up like last time, it was just rushed. And speaking of the parents, you'd think that after the father learned his lesson in the predecessor, that he'd be getting back together with his ex wife or something. But nope. He's still divorced, and his ex wife hooked up with another bald dude. Oh, and do you wanna know the twist in this movie? Well, get this... The father was behind all the ghosts and demons scaring away the kids. Yep. Just like last time where the father had involvement with the fake arrest thing. Pitiful. Absolutely pitiful. And oh yeah, the film ends on somewhat of a cliffhanger, where (spoiler alert) it turns out that one of the creatures that haunted the kids was actually real. Oh, please don't do a Boo 3. I hope this was only a joke.

But through all the bad things this film had to offer, there were some things that I liked. A diamond in the rough, if you will. But it's more like a diamond in the litter box. I liked the return of Yousef Ereka. He was funny in the last one and was quite funny in this one. Also, that scene where Madea is in the police station and sees herself on a "Wanted" poster was pretty funny. (How the cops don't recognize her is beyond me.) But that scene seemed to drag, as well. But those things could not save the movie.

Overall, this was a disappointment. It had little effort thrown into it and was basically a retread of the first Madea Halloween movie. I do not recommend it... Unless you're a hardcore Madea fan and need to see

everything that this character is in.

10

(sent from my Iphone3) Good day Madea fans! I am writing this review from my seat in the theater, having just watched B002 3 times. Let me say this, this movie is a keeper! Don't let those snoozy reviews throw you off! You have to see this movie! From the opening credits to the last sound, this movie will keep you on edge. That Madea cat is something else and I have to say, my B002 Tshirt, just ordered from Amazon.com, is inbound as of yesterday! OK, back to the movie. B002 will keep you howling throughout, and if you are looking to be tricked? Have no fear as this movie is a treat! Get your popcorn, treat it with some hot saux, and sit back and relax. You will not be disappointed. B002 is not a Boo Hoo.

5

. . . and not in any good way. It's as if Harvey Weinstein, Bill Cosby, and O.J. Simpson have gotten together to remake THE HUMAN CENTIPEDE. Writer\Director\Boom Operator Tyler Perry peppers BOO 2 with the N-Word as he mocks Transgendered Folks, Christians, Wiccans, and Family Values. Maybe his Simmons Family and their three generations of prostitutes is enough of a lame joke to carry ONE film, but certainly not 43. A typical sample gag from BOO 2 is Pops Brian Simmons encouraging his slutty daughter Tiffany--who's dressed so she'd fit right in on the cover of about half of Mr. Perry's 1980s VHS tape Porno Collection--to dance the Peeing Dog at a Fire Hydrant, The Sprinkler, and The Toilet Seat. Mr. Perry needs to realize that for every Human Action, Nature requires an Equal and Opposite Reaction. The Blue-Man Pict and Green Leprechaun Races offered THEIR versions of BOO 2 just before Humanity was compelled to eradicate them. (When's the last time that a Blue Dude or a Green Witch plopped down next to YOU at the theater? Think about it.) BOO 2 very well could become the provocation that brings a similar Fate Down Upon Perry's People!

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
 Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
 Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
 Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
 Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
 Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
 Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
 Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
 Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
 Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

1

The 3D special effects for this movie were fantastic. The screenplay was so bad that it became a comedy, probably better than some comedies I have seen recently. Literally the audience was laughing out loud. All of the trite lines were there. But more disturbing was the not so cloaked attempt by Hollywood to get their message across:

1. The Democratic President is a hero. 2. HIs Secretary of State, a USA isolationist who wants to destroy American's enemies before they destroy us, is the bad guy. At least Ed Harris didn't try to look like Trump. 3. A self-driving car was the escape vehicle. 4. Global climate change is real and so bad (2019) that it could destroy the world. 5. The strong blond sexy female Secret Service agent could (and does) out do any man. Don't mess with her, she will shoot you dead. 6. Males need to bond more. They need to be soft and caring and their early boyhood competitiveness can destroy sibling relationships.. 7. An Iranian (by the flag on his uniform) is one of the villains, but in the end the Arabs of Dubai are saved. 8. A Mexican is the one who ultimately saves the overly masculine protagonist and the strong German female partner (Ach Du Lieber). The Mexican savior literally points to the flag on this sleeve at the end of the movie. 9. A precious precocious little girl looks forward to saving the future of the planet.

Not that I disagree with any of these principles necessarily but goodness. I haven't seen a propaganda movie like this in a LONG time. Based on the trailers, it obviously is supposed to appeal to males... so get them in the seats and let the sermons begin. Hollywood... please. All that money should have been given to the starving children around the world. Imagine how far it would go!

8

Wow, the critics went to town on this film didn't they.

Although this film wasn't close to perfect, it doesn't deserve such a low score.

My main negative critique was that the writing/screenplay was a

little

sloppy, although still very entertaining.

But either than that, the performances were decent, the cinematography/sfx well done and the directing was good.

An enjoyable film that I would see again maybe one more time, but certainly not deserving of such a low score.

7

This is an action-packed movie that will entertain you; and you will feel pretty okay about what you've just witnessed.

Very nice special effects. The storms were nicely done. CGI was convincing.

Why I think this works better than other "Natural Disaster" films is because they did not revolve the plot around the storms...the storms were just the vehicle of destruction used. It's more like a Live Free Or Die Hard conspiracy, but instead of hi-jacking the IoT, they are hi-jacking weather control satellites.

Good CGI, a fun movie.

7/10

*Had Bruce Willis been in it... would have made it an 8.5

7

In Geostorm, Earth is beset by natural disasters. In facing adversity, mankind developed a satellite station to prevent these catastrophes. While people overcame this problem, another conflict arises when it becomes opportune to use the technology as a weapon for sole global domination.

The setting in which the story takes place, you can say, parallels our own at the present in which we are experiencing technological advancements which perks we use to solve our crises but also create further dilemma as countries individually vie to be the world superpower.

Going to see the movie, I wasn't expecting much for it because it seemed like a so-so movie that's probably been done before only re-released with a "semi different plot" under a different title. But I was surprised by how entertaining it is. There's the timeliness of its subject, there's definitely humor (which is funny but I thought they somehow overdid with some of the dialogue) but this one has also dramatic scenes that would touch you. The pathos really got me emotionally involved with what the characters are experiencing. This aspect I really enjoyed.

The downside, I can still say that it seems a lot of it's contents were borrowed from/ inspired by previous natural disaster/sci-fi flicks such as Day After Tomorrow (look at one of its posters for instance), Armageddon, and Gravity to name a few. This might be a turnoff for moviegoers who are expecting originality and it will most likely be so but for me, I got over it and had myself a good time in the cinema. It is definitely not the best movie this year or ever but its up there

with the good, entertaining ones I really enjoyed watching this year.

10

When the network of satellites designed to control the global climate start to attack Earth, it's a race against the clock to uncover the real threat before a worldwide geostorm wipes out everything and everyone. Geostorm is one of those films that i didn't expect to go see on the Big Screen or even like in general. Unlike past disaster films this one is actually more grounded and more realistic in it's own way and it's not some volcano or an earthquake it's actually humans that pull the strings here. The acting is also impressive by everyone from Gerard Butler to Abbie Cornish to Andy Garcia and beyond. The cgi are top notch with a lot of impressive and beautiful shots of cities falling down or entire buildings and airplanes. It also goes a bit dramatic during the end and i gotta say it does touch you on those feelings, there's also comedy of course and although not every joke hits some of them are actually pretty great and even when it's slow a bit it picks right after especially the last 30 to 35 minutes are action packed, special effects nerdgasm. Thanks to an all star talented cast, impressive cgi and some heartfelt moments Geostorm is an action packed popcorn flick that some people will love and some others won't it depends on your own personal taste and if you like this kind of movies in general but if you enjoyed films such as 2012, Armageddon, Volcano, San Andreas and Dante's Peak you won't be disappointed.

1

I don't know who keeps asking movies about natural disasters, but Independence Day: Resurgence, 2012, San Andreas, among others, proved that it's not a very good idea. But as long as the majority likes it, who am I to judge?

OK, let's begin. Gerard Butler plays a man who saves our planet from natural problems, storms, cold winters, with the help of a space station, zzzzzzzzzzzz.

Geostorm is so full of CGI, that at one point you start to get headaches and you'll never understand what's behind the desire of destroying the planet. It has something to do with the White House, I didn't catch the idea because I felt asleep for a short period of time.

If you want a film full of disasters that are also eye-candy, Geostorm is not the best idea. The movie is the same as other disaster flicks, nothing new. I believe the writer wrote the script in 2-3 days.

If you want something mindless, with a total waste of talent, full of cliché's and loud sounds, Geostorm is the perfect choice.

8

I noted a few "rubbish" reviews, they seem to have been watching some

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

other movie. This has a pretty good premise (with actually possible science), and some excellent action and effects. I felt I got my ticket's worth, no question.

I would have rated it higher but there is a bit of cheesy voice-over at the end and some slightly cliché dialogue I wasn't in love with. still, those are minor flaws, and for somebody wanting a good weekend popcorn action movie, you will not be disappointed. plus Butler has a few great lines you will really enjoy.

8

I was pleasantly surprised how good this movie really is. I tend to like disaster movies so I may have given it extra stars than some. I gave it a strong 8 for the story line and the special effects. At times there were cheesy scenes but that is just the nature of the beast. Hollywood does it's best making these style movies as real as possible. Looking back at Volcano and Dante's Peak even those were done well for their time. It was nice to see Ed Harris and Andy Garcia in a movie too, seems like these guys take big breaks between movies. So without going on and on I recommend this movie for disaster buffs like myself.

1

I found this film to be very sleep worthy, in fact I had to check the plot afterwards as I kept dozing off. Very cheesy American human interest story about the relationship between two brothers was its central theme. The sci-fi was badly thought out and made Gerry Anderson look like an expert. The highlight for me was when the baddie was revealed to be a disciple of Trump. I left the cinema muttering 'we should have invested more in renewable energy'.

2

I was really looking forward to see this movie after I saw trailer for it. Oh, how I was wrong. I can't remember when have I seen such a bad movie in every aspect of it. Stupid dialogues, bad acting, really shallow plot... And of course, how can we bypass politics from real life... In movie, several countries participate in making the technology for saving Earth, but no Russians, they are bad, they don't want to save planet where they live... Really... Puke... At least I've collected a lots of points on my Cinema bonus card, so I watched it for free...

2

When the movie ended, the 8 year old behind me said, "Thats the end? Mom, they didn't show the Geostorm!" and I kid you not, he started to cry.

I can totally relate. We came to see destruction, that kid and I! To

see a disaster film! But, frankly, the only disaster here is the script.

First of all, the whole first 45 minutes could have been skipped. Frankly, no one cares about Gerald Butler and his relationship with his brother. (That whole plot line plays out like a lack-luster tele-novela.) And Jim Sturgess is so bad, the less we see of him actually talking the better. (I spent the whole movie thinking how much better it would have been if Sturgess's role had been played by Zazie Beetz. Zazie Beetz as the sister in the white house. Zazie Beetz having an affair with Secret Service agent Abbie Cornish... Now that would have been interesting...)

This is how they SHOULD have done it: Start the movie with the Geostorm clock. Right off the bat: count down to destruction! Weather going crazy! Mayhem!

Gerry Butler arrives to fix it. A German lady helps but everything starts to blow up. Meanwhile, Zazie and Abbie are racing around with the president shooting bad guys!

65% of the planet is destroyed! (For real! Even the dog!) But our heroes still pull it off, even though Ed Harris turns out to be the really wicked bad guy. (Isn't it ALWAYS Ed Harris?)

But surprise! The traitor on the space station is not the French guy! It's the skinny English guy who needs a shower! Gerry finally gets to beat someone up. (But it does look like he's beating up a 14 year old. Its kind of creepy, really.)

After killing the teen-aged brit and stopping the countdown at 1, Gerry and the German scientists are saved by a Space Mexican. (Literally the only good part of the movie is the Space Mexican.)

At no moment do we hear anything about Gerry's feelings. He is childless, so we are spared the horrible acting of the daughter. There is no whooshing, clunking or explosion sounds in the space scenes BECAUSE IT IS A VACUUM. There are some actual futuristic cars to go with all of the space shuttles and the fancy smart phones. Gerald Butler talks like a normal person and not guy in a bar in South Boston. (They could have named the movie "Southies in Space"!) Most importantly: THERE IS AN ACTUAL GEOSTORM!

No Geostorm. No movie. For real.

2

This was bad.... really bad! I am a big disaster movie fan and can sit through most things, but wow this was really boring.. the characters are shallow, predictable and the chemistry between them stilted and forced.

The special effects were OK, but you just didn't get any sense of the fear because there was no character that developed enough for you to fear for them.

I think a better movie would have been Gerard Butler developing the satellite system and saving the world from Global Warming in the first place.. at least that may have been believable.

I watched Geo Disaster on Syfy the other day and at the time was

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

thinking that it would be a poor mans Geostorm.. but seriously it turned out to be the better of the two films.. that should tell you just how dreadful this film was. It only gets 2 because the special effects were OK.

1

THERE IS NO GEOSTORM! Only a family drama and bad acting, some nice CGI effects about tornados at Asia, tsunami on Dubai (shit), cool climate changes at Rio de Janeiro (who are those people there? they don't look Brazilians), a lovely drama about a couple working at government, the conspiracy government that is not fault of the great president of that great united states of America (terrorists are always from other countries).

Tell me why the guy is so invincible? He goes to space, explodes a big station, and can survive everything! But he is a bad father to his daughter... oh no! If someone liked this movie and gave it some good 10 score, of course he was paid for it! No way!

2

I went to see Geostorm because it was the only movie playing on a night where I really wanted to go to the 4D-cinema. Since it was a disaster movie I figured it would go well with the big screen and the 4D-effects.

Right from start I felt that something was off. The dialogue and over all atmosphere felt tacky and the acting didn't seem genuine. This was only the beginning though.

Geostorm is filled with canned dialogue and cliché's that will make you cringe. Most of the actors under perform and there's no real chemistry between the main actors.

During the whole movie you feel like you're watching a movie that you've already seen and the tropes used are so in-your-face that you almost feel provoked.

I was thinking about leaving several times during the movie but since I was with friends I decided to stay. During the climax of the movie several people in the audience were loudly mocking the movie and laughing at the absurdity of it all.

Everything about Geostorm was a disaster. It was very predictable and preachy and the director actually made you feel dumb throughout most of the movie. The only OK thing was the CGI but even that felt re-used and tired.

Nobody should watch this movie. It's utterly bad and should be avoided at any cost. I don't even want to think about how much money was spent on this garbage

1

Hollywood is officially DEAD! They have run out of ideas and keep recycling the same trash over and over all the while shoving their far-left liberal politics down the throats of a fed-up public whose beginning to wake up. This sorry piece of CGI crap with a terrible script and actors who seemed like they phoned their performances in is what Hollywood calls entertainment to the masses nowadays. Don't waste your money or time on this turkey.

8

Probably because of the weak marketing campaign, I didn't hear much of Geostorm, and I watched it last night with low expectation.

And Woow!!! I did not expect to see it coming. It was so Good!! The Weather technology used in this movie are very detailed. I love how Geostorm makes this sci-fi movie into a thrill mystery. I love to see the chemistry between Jim Sturgess and Abbie Cornish. The only lacking here is the development between Jim Sturgess and Gerard Butler character.

While waiting for the big movie at the end of the year, Geostorm is definitely must watch.

9

I went for this movie since my wife likes watching movies with this theme. The Day after tomorrow or Apocalypse themed movies where nature is destroying everything. This movie surprisingly had more to offer. It has a fantastic suspenseful plot. The two main protagonists Gerard Butler and Jim Sturgess are brothers. They have fantastic chemistry and the story unfolds brilliantly. The special effects are awe-inspiring. A great effort. Loved it.

6

Plot Spoiler review? Extreme weather is killing the planet. Satellites around the globe are equipped to control the weather by shooting little pellets. It is controlled by a space station with the system designed by Jake Lawson (Gerald Butler). When the space station malfunctions, causing sharknados or something, only Gerald Butler pretending to be Mel Gibson can save the world...with the help from his brother (Jim Sturgess) who he must reconnect with to make a good personal story. It is quickly discovered it is sabotage and there is a mystery as to who would do this...unless you have ever seen a Scooby-doo episode, then you have it figured out. Are you smarter than a fifth grader? The science aspect of science fiction lacked explanation as to how they were able to control air pressure with pellets or the gravity maker which nearly every space film has, but in reality is not feasible any time soon...which is why NASA isn't working on one. The science fiction is more fiction than science. The mystery aspect wasn't really a

mystery so we are left with a passable thriller with some light moments, mostly provided by Adepero Oduye.

Guide: No swearing, sex or nudity.

3

Geostorm

fixating on the inner politics i.e. behind the stage was a wise choice rather than wasting the time with the vfx explosion which still doesn't mean that it's a promising movie as it contains lots of flaws and a poor writer.

2

This movie is one of those lame Sci-Fi movies with one difference. Good actors and good CGI. But what the hell in the world was that script?! I don't know any movie that caught me literally sleeping in cinema.

Anyways, script was so cliché; that there was nothing unexpected there.

And this is story not about Armageddon or anything similar, this is a story of 2 brothers, who fight with each other and 'good'; and ofc 'bad'; guys. There is also so much nonsense, people are using gasoline cars, but they are able to deploy millions of satellites and make net over whole damn earth.

Rockets are like deployed every day, multiple times, by not new tech, but current rocket system, which is unbelievable stupid.

He is sitting in a rocket the same way like when you would go to supermarket to buy groceries, just turn on and fly to the space.

And let's forget all these things, but the thing that HE BUILT THE NET is most amazing stupidity in the movie.

There is one good, and one bad guy. Why people cannot be good and bad at same time in this kind of cliché movies. The 'bad' guy is destroying world intentionally. This can be compared to a guy who tries to open a packaged food can with a nuclear bomb. This is nothing.

I ignored even nonsense about instant weather changes, where people are burning and out of sudden, just 2 meters away there is normal temperature and there is NO WIND. Whoever cooked the soup know that soup starts moving in all directions on temperature change, similar goes with the air. but, author of this script doesn't understand that. With this budget he SHOULD KNOW that almost everyone knows the basics of physics. But let's forget even this.

The thing that during the movie you figure out the resolution of conversation after 10-30 seconds, but conversation lasts for another 10 minutes. This made me so bored that I couldn't watch it. This killed, destroyed and vanished all my will to watch movie.

Terrible, very very stereotypical American, physics taken from some other universe and truly awful. Popcorns in cinema was best

entertainment, and games on my phone.

1

WARNING - CONTAINS PROGRESSIVE PROPAGANDA AND OTHER SPOILERS

I like disaster movies. I like good CGI when it serves a purpose. I like good acting and memorable characters. What I don't like is Leftist, Liberal Propaganda shoved in my face as not only as a plot element, but the entire movie script as well! I thought that this was supposed to be an entertaining Sci-Fi Disaster Flick. Here are the main points for you to consider: 1.) CAGW is not only real, but it will happen TOMORROW; 2.) Only Democrat Presidents are Good; 3.) Technology is so flawed, that any idiot can take it over for nefarious purposes; 4.) The World can Unite under the United Nations to produce Great Feats of Global Engineering; and 5.) CGI can bail out a Horrible Film. Frankly, I am getting so tired of Political Viewpoints infecting Sci-Fi and Action Films. If you want to do Political Propaganda Films, please make them International Thrillers or Dramas or something other than Blatantly Obvious, In Your Face, Left Wing Political statements. And if you want to do a Climate related Disaster Film, don't repeat the already used and absurd "Instant Mr. Freeze" effect that can't be performed without dumping a cryogenic fluid on someone or somehow causing an airplane to fall out of the sky by instantly freezing the aircraft without suddenly encasing it in a solid block of ice! Been there, Done that already. Now, if you want to use a form of EMP attack, at least it would be believable. Suffice it to say, that like many recent feature films that have been ruined by inserting political garbage as a major plot element, Geostorm should be avoided at all costs, unless you are a die hard Al Gore lunatic!

7

Geostorm is pretty much as good as a disaster film can get. The SFX & VFX are phenomenal, the acting is good, the story line is a bit silly, but most disaster movie plots are.

Geostorm isn't as good as Into The Storm, but is better than San Andreas.

This is a movie for the big screen, if you like disaster films then you should go and see Geostorm.

9

We've all seen such movies where mankind is facing certain destruction. Countless movie titles and countless resembling points. Seems all the available ideas have been taken and put to use, but it doesn't mean that a movie cannot be intriguing or thrilling.

Geostorm has the all-knows scenario - series of events strike the Earth, lots of people die and bunch of heroes try their best to save

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

them all.

But the story and action are very well made. It's dramatic, suspenseful, sometimes funny with some nice touches. The effects are good, well not like Avatar or The Avengers, but still realistic. I'd even say that the acting is very good.

Assets and flows, leave them behind, I find the movie really cool and I don't regret watching it.

9

This movie surprised the hell out of me and so did the rest of the audience(there was genuine applause at the end of the movie). Before watching I'd read some negative reviews, thankfully I ignored them and decided to watch it. The entire movie is directed well, despite the the difficult theme and message it delivers. I must say if it weren't for the beautiful flow to the movie and some good performances from the actors this would've flopped. I don't want to give you any hints which could be a spoiler alert, but there are two very important messages it delivers: 1) Do not mess with nature. 2) Regardless of race, religion, color etc, the planet and also the cosmos is one!

10

Critics are not fair once again. This movie was very good, I loved it. Gerard Butler nailed it and so did the men and women on his team. I was on the edge of my seat throughout the movie. There were some funny lines that the audience enjoyed too. There was drama, sadness, action. I will be seeing this one again. The story lines all blended together very well.

4

When you watch the trailer of "Geostorm";, you can easily get excited by the stunning VFX and ultra catastrophic incidents (Mega Tsunami, etc.). However, after watching the full movie, you realize that they have packed the trailer with all the action scenes, so expect nothing new at the theater. Unlike "2012";, this movie has a far less reasonable plot or intense scenes, the science behind it is also kind of a joke compared to similar titles. Unfortunately, it is one of those consumer movies where the protagonist arguably saves the world at the last second of a countdown. The movie ISN'T BAD though, it has a good package of this and that, it just doesn't meet the fan high expectations following its propaganda.

5

I had been waiting for this movie since the first trailer I saw early in the year. I have to be honest in that I walked out before the end as I had seen it (a similar ending) 1000 times before in other movies. And

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

I didn't care enough about the story or characters to stick around. The ending is just ridiculous in the same mold as Gravity and Passengers. I like Sci-Fi as much as anyone but not when it gets too impossible to even kind of believe it then I can't take it. I have to have some thread of reality to cling to.****Spoiler Alert**** At the end when the space station is disintegrating and millions of little parts are blasting all over the vicinity the 2 space walkers are just bouncing along hard into sharp type objects and somehow avoiding said millions of pieces of shrapnel any one of which would have ended their joyous space waltz forever.....couldn't take.....oh well....."He made a promise" gimme a break! other spfx were well done....not the end

6

The idea behind this movie is good, but the realization is awful.

The movie failed because of the director, who appears to be pretty bad at being a director. He tried to create a good science fiction but ended up creating something that reminded me of the second part of Independence Day (which was an awful science fiction). Another thing that ruined this movie was the poorly written script, which was also written by this incompetent director.

However there are a few things that make this movie not that bad. They tried to get rid of the "The USA saves the world" cliché (they failed, but hey - at least they tried). The idea behind the movie was good and original. But as I already said the director's fault) ruined it.

This movie had the potential of becoming a great science fiction, such as Interstellar and The Martian but only if it was directed by a more talented person. Still I give this movie 6 out of 10, simply because the idea was original and managed to unite fiction and catastrophe into one. Too bad they failed to find a decent director, who will be able to make this idea into a masterpiece.

10

Best movie ever...

Brilliant 3D & 4D work....

Worth Watching a nice movie after long time...

The 3 D & 4 D effects are mind blowing.

I would strongly recommend every one to watch this movie...

7

After reading the reviews nearly passed on Geostorm but having enjoyed a few movies critics have panned and vice versa decided to brave the storm (sorry) and risk it. Despite some clunky script at times & stereotyping I settled down to a film i found not so much a disaster movie but more a race against time mystery/thriller. And in that light I quite enjoyed it.

The film is saved by some strong female characters

(including Gerard's daughter who manages to convincingly resemble my own 12 year old - a mixture of plain speaking childhood vulnerability and strong common sense) plus a concept that's half believable, if hugely depressing (in light of recent weather disasters). The special effects are pretty good. Perhaps we're spoiled and have seen too many Days after Tomorrow and 2012s to appreciate them anymore.

7

Just to get it out of the way the science on Geostorm is... not good. It reminds me of The Core or Armageddon. You just have to accept it and move on, I feel it unjust to judge the movie on something that they obviously put little emphasis on.

The basic idea is that is that thanks to global warming we needed a net of weather control satellites (literal a net, as in they are connected in space) to keep weather from being insanely bad. They start going bad and doing stuff like freezing an Afgan village, or cooking part of a city like a microwave. Two brothers try and find out what is going on a fix it. One goes to orbit the other stays on earth. It had two threads and many characters and used them well. It's a spy thriller with a large dose of a natural disaster movie thrown in. I could have done without the environmental message but it did not really get in the way, also the science was so ridiculous that you could not really take it seriously.

www.JoshuaLawrencePike.com

7

Predictable, but my mom likes this movie as she shed tears. I don't know why Max hates Jake so. Better if Max & Jake didn't have any issue before Jake was fired, then they're off over 5 years, until Dutch Boy went rogue. And Max, if it is Jim Sturgess's style, why is so rushy since beginning, he should have been a calm person, with neat haircut.

6

Poorly Written Poorly Executed Poorly Acted Too many plot lines Very predictable

I went to see this film at the cinema with some friends to celebrate the end of a term, and I found it shocking that the ADS were more enjoyable than the film. Of course, my friends and I talked through the ads, making fun of them, and that's what made them enjoyable. We also talked through the actual FILM, but we found that there was too much to talk about, because it was so boring, and we didn't want to disturb the audience, so we kept our traps shut. I regret that choice.

How the hell can all of these disaster movies be so bad; I mean there's Godzilla, San Andreas and this train wreck. The story is so bad, though it is an interesting idea; but we had the villain who was behind the

whole scheme have no depth put into him so we, the audience can understand his motivations, and maybe even sympathize with him. But, no, we just have this character lazily thrown into the story at the last minute to create a form of a movie. His motivations hardly make sense, as well; I mean, he decides to blow everything up, including himself, so he can be President!??? Good plan, I hear you muttering, but it gets even better when the character (I'd rather not say) actually tells the "bland as tofu" heroes how to stop the 'geostorm' from happening!!! How the hell can I NOT complain about the writing, when it is THIS bad!?!

My friend, who sat next to me, and I pretty much predicted what's going to happen as the story continued; "Oh, he's gonna get killed"; "Oh, that guy's gonna escape". It even got so bad that when the villain was INTRODUCED, we guessed that he was the guy behind the 'geostorm' crap. And the clichés! So many clichés! They even used "the guy saves the day when the countdown reaches '1' cliché". Who uses that any more? Even "Alien" tricked the audience into believing they were doing that, and how did they trick the audience? Because that story can't be predicted like this one!!

The acting of some people are horrendous; and there's one actress I have to mention because I haven't seen anything LIKE it. Telitha Eliana Bateman, is only like 11, right, so I can't bully her too much, but Jesus, who the hell cast her into this film AND make her narrate it? I seriously hope they got sacked, along with Telitha.

However, there is one tiny part I liked about the film, which doesn't even matter to be honest, and that is the CG, because it looks pretty nice. But as another reviewer, also on this movie, said: "They spent 50 million on the special effects budget, but only 10 dollars on the screenplay budget."

In Conclusion, this film is a boring mess that tries to be more than it bargains for and so just makes it ANOTHER Disastrous Disaster Movie

6/10

10

Even before watching it, you already pretty much know what you're getting from this movie: scenes of big destruction & peril, cities crumbling, buildings toppling, and people running for their lives, etc. If that sounds fun, you will enjoy this movie. If you like other disaster movies like 2012, San Andreas, Day After Tomorrow, etc., you'll probably like this one. If you wanna be a snob and complain about writing or dialogue or whatever... well, what did you ever expect from a movie like this anyway? Just sit back and enjoy the disasters and explosions and have fun and you'll have a good time.

It's a movie that does what it sets out to do, so it gets a 10/10 from

me.

Interestingly though, there's also a space station disaster subplot that's a bigger proportion of the movie than you might expect. Gerard Butler actually spends the bulk majority of the movie in a malfunctioning/exploding sci-fi space station, which is nothing to complain about, because the space disaster scenes actually look super impressive. In fact, I think the space scenes were actually worth my IMAX 3D ticket more than the weather scenes.

Other things of note: I thought it was pretty funny that at one point Gerard Butler's American character randomly points out that he was actually born in the UK. It's like someone behind the camera realized that his American accent sounds kinda wobbly and wrote in that line as a clever way of excusing it.

10

Going into the cinema with a friend we were both really looking forward to this movie, as soon as it ended I made sure I rated it 10 out of 10, he looked at me and thought I was crazy. I looked at him and told him that it was better than 2012, movies like this according to him need to have more action in them, I disagreed. I believe this movie had all the elements necessary for a great movie, the highlight for me was the screenplay, the dialogue and the acting which were all tremendous. Every character played his/her part well and with real emotion. I was not in any way disappointed, I went to see a movie that I had a great expectations about and I walked out of the cinema feeling very satisfied. All these negative reviews am I seeing for this movie don't make sense, I think that we need to focus more on the individual elements that make up movies, not just looking at the movie as a whole. I would not have made any changes to the script or any of the parts, it was visually engaging for the majority of the time and I would recommend it to anyone who not only likes a bit of action but some light hearted moments as well. Definitely would see this again, no doubt about it.

10

Tesla Tesla Tesla

This movie has Elon Musk written all over it.

It's about a space engineer trying to fix a weather-controlling satellite before a massive disaster, the Geostorm, with a pretty big budget, and a great cast, including the well-known guys like Gerald Butler, Ed Harris and Andy Garcia, it succeed to deliver. Ultimately, Geostorm is a solid enough movie, with good directing, great music, good acting, and possibly one of the craziest disaster movies out there.

Gerald Butler is great as the troubled Jake. The crew of the ISS is also great, particularly Alexandra Maria Lara as Commander Ute, Eugenio Derbez as Hernandez, and Amr Waked (who I at first thought it's Antonio Banderas) as Dussette. Ed Harris is amazing as Leonard Dekkom, and Andy Garcia is also very good as President Palma. Jim Sturgess as Max,

however is wooden at times, so does Abbie Cornish as Secret Service agent Sarah Wilson, although she did get some bad ass moments which is great.

The movie pushed the boundaries of believability, and presents us with probably one of the most craziest, over-the-top doomsday scenario ever put on film. Frozen on the Afghanistan desert, extreme heat on Hong Kong, and massive tsunami in Dubai is just one of the examples of how over-the-top, but still enjoyable film. It's a solid mark on Devlin's directorial work, and we can expect to see him directing again soon. The story's focus about climate change actually helps in adding tension and kept us imagining what happened if these disasters happened in real life. The humor is also well executed, and worked, especially those who seems to come straight outta a meme("Marry Her! - the president). The editing is also, very well done. Intense scenes felt very intense. Action scenes felt very exciting, and emotional scenes felt very impactful. They also tried at concealing the plot twist in the movie, and they did very well. The cinematography is good, and the music is also, very good, another remarkable work by Lorne Balfe. What does surprise me is it's political subplot, which actually, a great idea (but leads to one of my gripes with this movie).

Geostorm is insanity at it's finest. The over-the-top plot, along with great cast, good performance and an all-out spectacle of destruction makes it a enjoyable ride from start to finish.

7

I saw a pre-screening of Happy Death Day and let me tell you, it was one of the most fun theater experiences I've had. The movie doesn't take itself too seriously, which is definitely for the best. If anyone walks into a movie about a sorority girl living the same day over and over and being killed over and over and expects it to be some genre-defying horror perfection, that's on them.

However, that doesn't mean this is a bad movie by any means. Jessica Rothe as Tree Gelbman and Israel Broussard as Carter Davis are fantastic as the two leads. They have excellent chemistry and make us root for them. Rothe's character wasn't the typical horror movie sorority girl, either. She was cunning and badass. She made us believe she could actually figure this mess out. If you don't change your mind on who the killer is at least twice throughout the film, you aren't paying attention.

There are curveballs thrown left and right, which made my theater gasp and yell numerous times. You think the movie is about to end on at least two different occasions. The script is smart, there's horror, there's comedy, there's drama. Happy Death Day takes you in numerous directions, while also making sure you have fun along the way. This is definitely one of my all-time favorite campy horror flicks out there. It even pokes fun at Groundhog Day, which it very clearly took some inspiration from. I recommend this to anyone who enjoys horror; again, it doesn't redefine the genre and there are definitely an abundance of

clickés. With that, though, there are still a handful of clever moments I certainly was not expecting.

8

When I saw the trailer for this movie I admit I rolled my eyes and groaned that they were trotting out the circular time gimmick again. It was of course classic in Groundhog Day, but never seemed to click since then. I was dubious, but after seeing it with my own eyes, I can say I had a great time. I'm not sure if Blum House intended it to be funny, but it had a lot of humor in it, enough I would say to qualify it as a dark comedy. The cast was superb and while it didn't offer anything groundbreaking in terms of murders/deaths, I didn't mind because the story was so well connected and it really had me guessing right up until the end. Another litmus test for the quality of this movie is that the audience was rather quiet during the presentation. I've been to enough of these films to know that when you get a young audience seated in the dark and the film is a snooze, they'll start to talk and whisper and just annoy the Hell out of you. This movie managed to hold the attention of the entire audience and in this day and age I must say, that is an achievement in and of itself. I wasn't prepared to enjoy Happy Death Day as much as I did, but even I can admit when I was wrong. It worked from start to finish. I wasn't aware that Scott Lobdell wrote the script, but when I saw his name in the credits, I realized another reason I enjoyed it. I am familiar with his writing in the comic book industry and he is one of the more notable scribes. It's good to see the skills transfer.

8

I think people going to see this movie are expecting wayyyy too much from a slasher movie. I'm rating it based on what I expected, and I was certainly impressed. This movie wasn't trying to be anything more than another murder movie, but what made me want to see it was the idea of taking Groundhog Day (which it fully admitted to ripping the idea from) and turning it into a slasher film. I was actually surprised it held back on gore and blood. I was fully expecting it to be all the tropes of gross-out killings, but it was instead focused more on character development and the story. I admit the characters are a bit one-dimensional, but again, it's a slasher movie. It's trying to win any academy awards here. In many ways I think it's parodying those one-dimensional characters of college trope characters and the "last girl" in horror movies because it goes all-in on establishing the main characters as somebody you're meant to hate at first. The ending genuinely took me in a direction I didn't anticipate, and then it took me back to what I was expecting, but did it in a way that I felt fresh. All in all, I had fun watching this movie, which I think what this movie was meant to be: Fun.

10

I went into Happy Death Day with low expectations, thinking it would be a fun yet cheesy horror movie. I was right about one thing: it's very, very fun. Now, don't let the frightening trailer fool you: this is a not a very scary movie. Yes, there are some tense moments, usually followed by a jump scare, and there was moderate PG-13 violence, but this movie succeeds more in its one-liners than its death sequences. There are tons of good jokes from Jessica Rothe, who is the best part of this movie by far. And there is a twist, it's not very memorable, but it's smart and well thought out, and it leads to a very satisfying end fight scene. Despite the misleading marketing, Happy Death Day is an hilarious and entertaining horror/comedy.

9

This type of movie has been done many times before and rarely succeeds, but this one was a hit for me!

Jessica Rothe's performance is what kept me interested... she nailed her character and was convincing and funny as well.

I don't want to give too much away, but the twists towards the end were a nice surprise and earned a few extra points from me.

It's classified as a Horror, Mystery, Thriller but it's also a comedy as I found myself laughing a bunch of times.

Certainly a must-see entertaining film produced and executed very well, much better than many other films in this genre.

It's a well deserved 9/10 from me.

10

I'm starting to see a trend develop in modern horror movies (the good ones at least) and I really like it. Film makers are beginning to realise that for horror to work there has to be some different levels to the film. 90 minutes of watching people get killed isn't going to be able to cut it anymore. You have to be able to make the audience laugh, think and even move them emotionally. If you can do that then your film will be a success. Earlier this year 'Get Out' pulled it off and now 'Happy Death Day' has nailed it too.

When the opening logos featured a joke (literally in the first few seconds of the film) I thought I may have misread the tone of the film in the trailers. Turns out I had, but in a good way. It wasn't an indication that the film was to be a laugh-fest, simply that it had that layer to it. And the thing about the layers that the film possesses is that every one of them works. Whatever it tries to pull off it manages.

The twists and turns and how crafty it is about concealing them truly blew me away. At least three times I thought to myself such and such

element would be better if they'd done so and so, only to later find out they did indeed have that up their sleeve the whole time. The film is incredibly smart.

I can't say enough good things about this film. The trailers won't give a fair indication to people of what this film is truly capable of, and so sadly I fear many who would love it will not get around to seeing it. If you get the chance though please do see it. It's a fantastic film and you won't be disappointed.

7

The trailer for this film accompanied by 50 Cent's "In Da Club" looked incredibly dumb, but that didn't mean that the film wasn't going to be a stupid good time. These types of repetition of a certain day films are somewhat popular with recent incarnations being completely forgettable. Groundhog Day gets it right, and I was curious to see a college slasher drama try to take a different spin on the idea.

The film is about Tree Gelbman, a typical short fused sorority girl who loves to party and get drunk and her trials against a day that keeps repeating. On her birthday she is murdered and the day keeps resetting until she can figure out who her killer is. The daily death takes a toll on her body and she gets physically weaker each time. its a tough task having to try to figure things out when everything around her resets and the killer and his/her motivations remain unknown.

Jessica Rothe was just perfect for this role. She's an attractive lead who played the college girl role to a tee. Her character grows by the end of the film and you start to feel a better connection with her as she becomes a different human being when her constant death teaches her

about her own life. Other than that, there aren't really many fleshed out or identifiable characters, which is fine. This is a cheap thriller and should be treated as such, doesn't mean it isn't entertaining.

The repetition surprisingly doesn't overstay its welcome and keeps itself fun. This film is barely a horror because it's so stupid and the film knows it. It's more of a comedy with killing than anything else. Which is perfectly fine. The killer reveal is kind of obvious despite the writers trying to twist you away from it. Overall, you won't have much of an impression from this picture but it makes for a good time in the cinema.

6.5/10

7

Jessica Rothe is amusingly pithy and savvy playing a selfish college beauty, a spoiled sorority sister who rules the school until she is stabbed and killed on her way to a surprise birthday party by a masked lunatic. But fate plays this campus cutie an unusual hand once she discovers she's living her birthday over and over again, each time attempting to cheat death but always running into her attacker. Screenwriter Scott Lobdell isn't trying to sneak a slasher variant of 'Groundhog Day'; passed us--he's upfront about the similarities, even exalts in them, while toying with all the possibilities such a scenario can offer. It takes Rothe three tries to fully comprehend what's happening to her; once she formulates a plan (creating a suspect list), Lobdell mixes things up, so that the movie rarely feels repetitive. Our heroine, snarky to start, follows Bill Murray's example and becomes a better person on her twisted journey (reestablishing contact with her father, apologizing to her roommate, even causing her own demise on one occasion to prevent the cute nerd from the boys' dorm from losing his life). Director Christopher B. Landon deserves credit for delivering a modern-day thriller with lots of action but no gore and no nudity. If it isn't quite a family-friendly slasher flick, it certainly is a

squirrely, sassy one, with some big laughs counterbalancing the suspense. Good show! *** from ****

10

The terror in Happy Death Day is the movie's comedy, as the point is to represent the compromise of eternity being allowed to experience censorship as a means to its existence.

Eternity is an impossible venture without origin. Origin is therefore something which isn't infinite, and for the sake of juxtaposition is destructive. The origin which is meant to hurt is the paradox of being meant to help eternity come to fruition.

Further juxtaposition, is that eternity itself becomes a force which isn't based around being for the sake of anything. Eternity is the end product of visual symmetry, but for the connection between eternity and visual symmetry to operate, the nature of the visual symmetry has to comprise nervousness. The internal state of conflict that defines the visual symmetry is the logic of the visual symmetry being its own self-supporter, even though eternity was never completely independent.

In Happy Death Day, visual symmetry is the end product, and the compromise of its status as an end product is that its composition is pointlessness and nervousness. In contrast, visual hierarchy sets the movie off, and the usual composition of visual hierarchy is assumption and objective. Theresa's story goes from visual hierarchy to visual symmetry, and the hierarchy elements are based around meeting objectives, while the equality elements are based around past events.

So in essence, Happy Death Day is the style of hierarchy being about future objectives, and equality being about the past as he contrast is the representation of the symbiotic relationship between eternity and its point of origin.

Of course, all of this makes Happy Death Day into a film which is excellent, inspiring and moving. Jessica Rothe is fantastic as Theresa Gelbman, and it's precisely her story that represents the complexity of loneliness being a virtuous concept. Happy Death Day is a much more intellectual movie than most other horror films - and most other comedies period.

By a long stretch, one of the best movies of 2017

8

With Halloween coming up, I started taking a look at what Horror movies were being shown on the big screen. Finding Vincenzo Natali's Haunter (which has the same hook, but a darker tone) to be superb, I was excited to spot a film on the big screen with a similar set- up, which led to me joining in the Death Day.

The plot:

Waking up with a killer hangover on her birthday, Theresa Tree; Gelbman pushes fellow student Carter Davis to the side, and spends the entire day being grumpy to everyone, from binning a birthday cupcake her roommate Lori makes, to ignoring her dad's invitation to meet up (Tree's

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

late mum had the same birthday.) Going to a party later that night, Tree is stopped in her tracks by a masked stranger, who gets out a knife and kills her. Expecting to be dead, Tree instead finds herself re-living her birthday (where the same person kills her.) Caught in a time-loop, Tree starts trying to find out who the masked killer is, in order to stop her unhappy death day.

View on the film:

Setting the timer, the screenplay by X-Men Comic-Book writer Scott Lobdell spends the opening 15 minutes cheekily ribbing the clichés of the Slasher genre, via Davis being the well-meaning pretty boy, Tree being the popular, mean "it girl";, and Tree's entire clique being based

around showing the nerds who really is too cool for school. Catching Tree in a time loop, Lobdell gives the shiny Slash shocks sharp, underlying psychological terror, as each time she is murdered, leads to Tree getting increasingly raw fears that she will never escape the loop. Along with slicing up over a dozen, weapons- grade "Final Girl" battles, Lobdell takes an excellent stab at Horror-Comedy, that shines in each attempt Tree makes to survive the day, from Tree walking round the campus care-free and naked, to the headache Tree gets of having to re-live a deadly morning routine.

Perfectly stepping in time with Lobdell, director Christopher Landon &

cinematographer Toby Oliver turn the Slasher Knife with an irresistible Pop-Rock atmosphere, of whip-pans around the campus, and neon lights over the killings that creates a party mood. Backed by a jumpy score from Bear McCreary and a great mask designed by "Ghostface" creator Tony Gardner, Landon gets into the Slasher groove with ultra-stylised tracking shots following Tree and the psycho, and overlapping slo-mo eyeing the wear and tear Tree experiences in the loop. The only one aware of what is happening, Jessica Rothe gives an excellent performance as Tree, whose sarcastic dry-wit Rothe hits with a real relish, that transforms into a tough, thoughtful confidence, as Tree wishes her killer a happy death day.

7

I had low expectations and I have to say they were totally exceeded .

This is an enjoyable Romantic Horror with more than a passing reference to GROUNDHOG DAY - and the occasional reminiscing of the 15 year old Shaun of the dead . Plus a bit of Scream , scary movie and a number of other slasher movies .

Jessica Roshe was brilliant in the starring role , you believe in her

character , her charm was endearing and despite the 10 years between her character and actual age she played the combination of innocent romantic with a touch a modern feisty independent female in control of her own destiny .

The only poor point was how the inevitable twist was handled - that

could have been slightly better but definitely worth seeing .

Pad.A 7/10

7

I was pretty excited to see this movie. I loved "Before I Fall" and I also love Horror/Thriller films....so seeing that "Happy Death Day" was a combination of both of those things, I decided that I should go see it.

I honestly thought this film was pretty decent....even though it wasn't quite as good as I wanted it to be.

The biggest problem was that this movie didn't scare me at all. I might have felt a little spooked just once...but that hardly the "OMG I so scared god!! Argh!!" type reaction that the movie wanted me to have. None of the scary/suspenseful scenes really got me. I feel like this happened because this movie tried to be two things at once. It tried to be a drama like "Before I Fall" while also trying to be scary like "Scream" yet only ends up being OK in both ends of the spectrum. It feels like "a jack of all trades master of none" situation.

The other problem was the exposition involving our heroine was poorly handled. Not spoil things...basically our protagonist actually has a backstory....but it is given so little substance and emotional weight that it was just meh. It also isn't as integrated into the story as well as it could have been. I feel that her backstory could have been more developed and/or given more emotional impact.

Despite these problems, I still enjoyed the film.

I liked the plot. Even though I never felt scared, the movie gave me more than enough interest for me to be invested in the story for the entire run time. It will most certainly keep you engaged. And I think the pay off to that story was pretty good, even if it felt a bit rushed in hindsight.

I also enjoyed the performances. Obviously none of them are going to be Oscar-winning material, but I think they did the job well enough that I felt immersed in what was going on. So good job guys!!

Another thing that I liked was that I didn't find myself cringing constantly like I do with other horror media like the "Scream TV show." Never once did I find myself rolling my eyes whenever someone open their mouth. Is the dialogue particularly memorable? Not really. But the fact that it wasn't a total cringe fest was certainly great news for me

Lastly, I thought the pacing was pretty decent. I did find it slow at times, but the story had enough going on that I never once felt bored or irritated or anything like that.

Overall, I found this movie to be reasonably enjoyable. Despite it's flaws, I found the story and the performances enjoyable enough that I can say that I had a good enough time. I give this film 3.5/5 stars.

8

This film is really one of a kind. It does a terrific job of evoking fear, as well as making you laugh out loud. The film itself is satirical in nature. It truly is a film everyone should go see, and is enjoyable for all ages. The film builds up well, and continues to

succeed up until the end. The ending is very outrageous in nature, and seems to be a forced plot twist filled with ridiculous exposition. The ending will either leave you amused, or just disappointed. This film is worth it though!

6

Happy Death Day comes from Blumhouse Productions, the studio made famous for the resurgence of horror in theaters (Get Out, The Purge, Insidious). However, this is the lightest of light thrills. Sure, it would fit in the slasher movie bin, but with its bubble gum aesthetics and goofy comedy, it's really more Freaky Friday than Friday the 13th. And in that sense, it's mildly charming; if not bright enough to be great. For starters, the premise is pretty stupid, and the execution of that premise isn't much better. A brash and awful sorority girl is forced to relive the same birthday over and over, each one ending in her own murder by a masked killer. Imagine Groundhog Day or Edge of Tomorrow, but in the teen-screams genre and with a lot less complexity. In fact, most of its "originality" just comes in its blanket theft from other properties and throwing them all together: the youth world of Mean Girls; the comedy of "Scream Queens"; the protagonist from "The Good Place"; the scares from The Purge. It's not bad, just familiar, like we're reliving this recognizable movie just as the character relives her day. Once our girl starts trying to solve the whodunit-mystery, things get more assured and fun, as we find it easier to root for her and her insistence on not dying each day ad infinitum. Even though the deaths and scares are wanting, the other elements work, especially the humor and (gasp!) the heart. It's harmless and forgettable October fare, made more for people who hate horror than me. In other words, my wife will love it.

1

Happy Death Day is one of the worst horror films of 2017. The cast is highly irritating, and just forgettable. Tree Gelbman yes you read that right, the main character is named Tree, played by Jessica Rothe. Her character is nothing that I even care for, just an ignorant girl from a rich family acting like she is better than anyone around her, her sorority sisters are just as pathetic. So here we sit watching some over privileged character walk through the steps of a "Groundhog Day" style film, living her death over and over again, which was portrayed in the trailer.

Scott Lobdell was the writer for this terrible film, and in my opinion highly plagiarized from Groundhog Day, except this hack of a writer will not be sued because the story was tweaked enough and he turned it into a horror slasher style film, instead of a comedy.

If people want to pay money to see such drivel then by all means, go right ahead. There is no likable character, I wanted them all to die,

and there is no point to see this film unless it's something to fall asleep to. That's it folks move along now nothing to see here. 6.7 is a fake rating made by this fake website and fake people. This is a big old zero people. Avoid at all costs.

5

Comedy, horror drama. The heroine played by Jessica Rothe is murdered at the end of her birthday! The murderer is disguised by a baby face mask, and she immediately wakes up at the beginning of the same day, over and over and over again. She now knows what will happen during the course of the repeating day and we then see her murdered again, each time in a different manner.

Every time she wakes we see that she has suffered some injury relevant to the murder, and these accumulate over the passing days. Her urgent need is to slowly piece together the evidence in the course of each repeating day until she can determine who the killer is. Every morning her frustration grows but at least she slowly progresses towards knowing who the killer is. Every morning we see her realise that reliving the same day gives her the opportunity to slowly learn how to be a better person.

Comparison with Ground Hog Day and Edge of Tomorrow are inevitable ` GHD is even referenced at the end during a brief conversation.

Jessica Rothe's performance is the only thing stopping this feeling like a very low budget made for T.V. movie.

8

If you get a strong sense of déjà vu watching Happy Death Day, that's because it takes the basic premise of Bill Murray classic Groundhog Day and adds a whole heap of familiar slasher clichés. But whilst undeniably derivative, the film still manages to be huge fun. At first one wonders whether it will succeed in offering anything beyond its high-concept mash-up premise, but as things progress it becomes clear that we're in safe hands, writer Scott Lobdell delivering a clever and witty script with director Christopher Landon confidently handling the action so that repetition never seems boring.

Replacing Murray's obnoxious weatherman is attractive but self-obsessed sorority bitch Tree (Jessica Rothe) whose birthday brings an unexpected surpriseadeath!aa psycho in a mask attacking her as she makes her way to a party. To Tree's horror, she is forced to relive the day again and again until she can work out the identity of her murderer and prevent herself from being killed. As in Groundhog Day, Tree is able to change the course of her repeated day with the knowledge she has gleaned, and ultimately becomes a much nicer person in the process. In the Andie MacDowell role is Israel Broussard as nice guy Carter Davis, who tries to help Tree with her terrible predicament.

Equal parts wry comedy and PG friendly horror, Happy Death Day isn't

about to scare your socks off, but thanks to fine performances from a solid cast, some imaginative plot twists, and a snappy pace, it's still hugely entertaining stuff that should appeal to horror and non-horror fans alike.

7

I was pleasantly surprised by this film! I went in expecting it to be a repetitive storyline incorporating a mad man in a stereotypical doll mask. I can truthfully say it definitely surprised me! As seen in the previews, Tree is reliving her birthday over and over, trying to figure out the man behind the mask. While the movie is a thriller, it was really the surprising pop ups that get you. I really recommend this movie to anyone finding themselves wanting a fun movie that isn't only going to make you spill your popcorn, but also leave the theatre thinking about everything you just watched unfold on screen.

6

Saw 'Happy Death Day' as somebody who was fascinated by the concept, found the advertising interesting and good enough to warrant a view and who appreciates horror when done well. Seeing it just before Halloween as part of my Halloween celebrations, will admit to not being as bowled over by the film as would have liked but enjoying it a good deal. As surprisingly interesting as the advertising was (and there has been some dreadful advertising this year, a notable recent example being the completely mis-marketed 'Geostorm'), it is also misleading. One would expect a truly frightening film judging from the trailers, but actually 'Happy Death Day' happened to be much more than what was indicated and wasn't what one would call terrifying or sleep-with-the-light-on-for-a-week. The good news is that 'Happy Death Day' actually makes the most of its concept, refreshing having seen films recently that had concepts that they didn't do anywhere near enough with. The not so good news is that as enjoyable as it was it did feel like something was missing. It is easy to see why lots of people will like, and have liked 'Happy Death Day'. It is just as easy to see why it will be, and has been, a let-down for others. My opinion has shades of both, leaning towards the former. 'Happy Death Day' may be somewhat standard (while the concept is a pretty unique one, some of the story elements aren't), superficial (other than the lead character, the characters are developed very flimsily) and some parts don't make as much sense as they could and feel unfinished. Was expecting more from the killer twist reveal, which is not as clever and surprising as one would like and the whole ending felt rather silly and rushed to me (the killer's motive also came over as really trivial for an elaborate set-up). A little slow to begin with too, it's once the concept kicks in when 'Happy Death Day' properly comes to life and

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

maintains that energy for the rest of the film.

For all those faults though, 'Happy Death Day' is also refreshingly self-aware, almost very much aware of its standard-ness and superficiality and acknowledges it, and manages to be lots of fun, creepy-suspenseful and surprisingly thought-provoking. Gruesomely funny sums it up very well.

'Happy Death Day' is a long way from amateurish visually, the photography is stylish rather than slapdash, the editing has suitably unnerving moments and the lighting is atmospheric. Christopher Landon never lets it get too heavy while not diluting the fun or scares, and the at times haunting and at others times funky soundtrack adds a lot.

When it comes to the script, 'Happy Death Day' is full of knowing humour and never removes its tongue from its cheek, instead keeping it firmly intact throughout which proved to come off really well. It also really makes one think. The story execution is not perfect, but it's never dull and has some neat twists and turns that stops it from being predictable and repetitive.

Jessica Rothe should become a bigger star after her excellent lead turn here, she has been acting a few years before this but this is the first time where she really held my attention and allowed me to take proper notice of her. Israel Broussard is also very believable and the two have great chemistry together. The acting on the whole is solid but essentially it's all about Rothe and she is one of the main reasons why 'Happy Death Day' is worth a viewing.

Overall, a long way from perfect but quite enjoyable. 6/10 Bethany Cox

7

I had a blast with this film and i absolutely loved it

Yes I know this concept has been done before; Groundhog Day, Source Code, Edge of Tomorrow and etc

BUT this film adds a new spin on the "same day repeats until the mystery is solved" concept by taking it and merging it with a slasher film premise

Now this kind of film could easily go downhill if wrongly executed but Happy Death Day does a decent job of handling this concept

It has fun with it and pokes fun at it

The film is also a bit self aware of the clichés and tropes of the slasher genre so it's understandable when something a bit dumb happens

It wastes no time and you can easily breeze through the entire film without feeling any fatigue because every twist and turn in the film keeps it fresh and entertaining and keeps you on the edge of your seat, it's also of the right run time, just 1 hour 35 something minutes which felt right for this film

It's very well shot too surprisingly, I don't think I've seen any of Chris Landon(the director of this film)'s work before but he impressed me with this film

There is a lot of humor which adds to the film because the film doesn't

take itself too seriously and doesn't take a very dark route even though it is still a horror film

It also has some cool scares and suspenseful moments, not too scary but that's fine by me because of the rest of the film kept me engaged

I have to mention the lead actress because my review would not be complete without mentioning her, Jessica Roth did a fantastic job as the lead girl in this film, her performance was so charismatic and its apparent that she enjoyed this role a lot because she delivered a better performance than i expected, A break out star performance and i hope to see her in more films now

And not just the performance, her character development in the film was simple but handled well, and combined with her performance, it made her character and her performance very likable

The mystery of the film is engaging although once it is revealed, you might criticize some parts of it but overall the film worked so little problems can be overlooked

The soundtrack is cool too, i looked for some of the songs after the film ended and i got hooked

It may not be a classic or a genre defining film but if you just want to forget your problems and have a fun time with maybe an easy to watch film, pick this up, Would be even better if you watch it in a group with maybe your friends, it'll be a good experience because Happy Death Day is very enjoyable

6

The trailer for "Happy Death Day" doesn't do the actual movie justice, something we see the other way around more often. I have to admit that partially because of this I was skeptical about it, only to be pleasantly surprised by the time the credits rolled. Don't get me wrong, in no way is this film supposed to be taken too seriously, yet I am glad that one is not forced to completely lower their standards to enjoy it.

Jessica Rothe's performance is great, even in the beginning of the movie where she is pretty much a total douche bag to everyone she somehow manages to come off quite charming and charismatic. And that's the thing about Happy Death Day; it's not necessarily a cinematic masterpiece, yet it has some kind of easy breezy charm to it which makes you curious.

The writers make the audience play a guessing game, more specifically "who killed me?" by (quite cleverly) introducing all suspects on the first day. Then it's up to the audience to decide who is most likely, or better yet unlikely the killer. The answer was neither shocking nor predictable, that's the only thing that left me unimpressed. Instead of having that "omg no way" moment you will probably be more like "huh? wait? it was them?". The reveal of the killer to be confusing is a flaw that cannot be overlooked, because it is what the entire movie has led

up to.

But other than that Happy Death Day was an entertaining watch, I would especially love to see more from Jessica Rothe. In a way the story line feels like a homage to the oh-so lovable classics it has drawn inspiration from. I guess that's reason enough to go and check it out. Be sure not to go into it too critically tough, it's hard to take a movie serious when the ones poking most fun at it (in an innocent way) are the creators themselves.

7

Although the core narrative is not original by any stretch, there are good reasons for liking this lightweight foray into the slasher genre. There are some original elements incorporated into the hoary old Groundhog Day chestnut – just enough dusting and polishing to make you forgive the pillaging. It doesn't aim for the same conceptual depth of, say, Timecrimes (2007), Triangle (2009), The Butterfly Effect (2004) or Edge of Tomorrow (2014) but it does manage to incorporate a nifty murder mystery thread into the time-loop motif and the execution feels a deal fresher than it probably should.

Bratty, morally challenged and egocentric frat girl Tree (Jessica Rothe) finds herself living her birthday over and over again, each day ending with her murder at the hands of a masked stalker. All she has to do is find out the identity of her killer and avoid being killed in order to break the cycle. The film is not hard core or extreme in any sense that might apply to the bulk of modern slasher flicks. There are no real scares, there is no excess of blood and guts, no explicit violence, no torture porn or gratuitous sexual activity or nudity. So what does it have going for it?

It's engaging, mildly funny in places and generally quite likable. Jessica Rothe is winningly cute in the lead. And not in a painfully forced or superficial way. Her gradual transition from selfish and self-absorbed sorority bitch to a more enlightened and humane persona is skilfully handled. You start out thinking she pretty much deserves her fate and then end up rooting for her to succeed. Rothe plays it just right and you can't help liking her. She is one of the most rounded and sympathetic female leads in a slasher movie since Jamie Lee Curtis in Carpenter's original Halloween (1978). In fairness, most of the cast deliver in terms of injecting some level of believability and personality into their rather clichéd stock characters.

HDD deserves credit for some stylish camera-work and editing – both of which are tight, smart and in some places strikingly unusual. The key emphasis is on taking a well-worn concept, playing around with it and having fun. And that's what you've got here, a fun genre piece that doesn't take itself seriously and entertains for the running time. Unlike Scream it doesn't lose itself in self-reverential satire and admiration for it's own cleverness in ragging on genre tropes, and is all the better for it.

It doesn't do anything ground-breaking or jolting, won't set the world

on fire, and anyone expecting a visceral thrill-ride is more than likely to feel short-changed. But, I found it enjoyable enough, even though I'm far removed & very far removed & from its target audience. And I must add that I was wrong-footed by the ending, fully expecting the stock horror movie twist which isn't really a twist anymore & the one where you think everything's OK but suddenly evil triumphs. The twist this time around was a bit different to what I'd resigned myself to. And Groundhog Day does get a belated name check.

So all in all, not bad, just about happy enough.

8

Happy death day is one of those films that turns out to be miles better than what the trailer offers you to go watch it.

Plot is interesting Tree (Jessica rothe) wakes up and relives the same day by getting killed over and over again and has to figure out who is the killer to stop this endless cycle.

Groundhog Day meets Scream, now it may sound a bit crazy but Christopher Landon (director) pulls of a great film in the way it's been shot and put together.

With some great acting, light hearted humour and a mystery that will keep you guessing right till the end Happy Death Day is a great horror/thriller and definitely one to watch this Halloween.

5

Some friends invited me for a horror mystery thriller movie, so all fine by me.

But then, the film started.... This was no horror film. Most of the movie felt like American Pie having the naked scenes replaced with some serial killer slaying again and again the same person without any obvious reason(or any reason whatsoever as I realized in the end).

Anyway, the actors were not memorable. Their acting skills were okay. I guess they would seem as something more to a teenager and this is why I am amazed by the number of good reviews this film got. The plot moves along in a totally predictable manner. We see repeatedly the same day of a rich sorority girl waking up in the room of some guy who was kind enough to pick up her pieces after she got wasted the night before. Then she goes on her day and gets killed in slightly different manner every night. Then wakes up at the guys dorm again and everything starts happening again until she finally realizes that she is trapped in a triangle-like situation. The theme is one we know all too well,so nothing much to expect there(so much for the thriller and mystery). The protagonist tries to explore some ways of solving the "mystery" but drops them all really fast so we see pretty much more of the same with tiny variations,while she tries to act all scared and panicked. Each morning finds her more screamy than the one before and the in-the-mean-time- reactions make things a bit funny or cringy. Certainly

not scary or thrilling.

The main problem with this movie is that it tries to pass itself as some horror,mystery film while it's a comedy- crime/light mystery, if it has to be called something. It's a total joke of a horror movie. And it would be amusing if it was advertised as such. You cringe,you laugh but you certainly don't feel any threat at any point. And that's understandable since you have little time to learn anything about any of the characters. What do we know? She dates and sleeps around,not surprising for a sorority girl. She gets scared when they try to kill her, but that's a normal reaction for any human being. After reliving the same thing over and over she decides to stop repeating her actions and explore other possibilities, so nothing really interesting here either.

In the end we had a movie with much more laughter than the amount justified for a horror film,no plot,not a deep mystery,in contrast to what we expected and no interesting characters. But we still managed to have some fun with this thrash dialogue film. Not really worth seeing.

9

I thought this was just a cheap slasher movie version of groundhog day.

Oddly enough it was. Girl wakes up in a dorm room goes about her day then gets murdered before the day ends just to repeat the day again and again with her murder hiding they're identity behind a mask.

Here is the surprise though. This movie is actually good! The girl is the stereotypical bitchy (or witchy if they've censored the movie like they did over here) cheerleader. Pretty much every single person in her life has a reason to want her dead. This works as you go through the list of suspects (sometimes hilariously) and don't feel bad seeing her die over and over.

It more then earns the big reveal in the end and I found it to be a fun light hearted popcorn movie for Halloween.

This movie got one extra point for being bold enough to actually straight up say "hey, you know what your story reminds me off? Groundhog day, that movie with Bill Murray." right at the end before the closing credits.

6

It was a fantastic coincidence this film came out close to when I was celebrating my 30th birthday, the trailer for this scary movie looked great, a cross between Groundhog Day and Scream, "Groundhog Slay" if you like, from Blumhouse Productions (Insidious, Whiplash, Get Out), so I was really looking forward to it. Basically Teresa "Tree" Gelbman (La La Land's Jessica Rothe) wakes up on her birthday, Monday 18th September, in the dorm room of classmate Carter Davis (Israel Broussard) following a heavy night of drinking. Tree leaves and spends the day being self-centered, dismissive and condescending to her fellow classmates and previous hook-ups, ignores calls from her father, throws

away a cupcake made by her roommate Lori Spengler (Ruby Modine, Matthew's daughter), and is having an affair with her professor Gregory Butler (Charles Aitken). That night, Tree is heading to her "surprise" birthday party, when she is lured into a tunnel, there she is murdered by a hooded figure wearing a baby mask, the campus mascot. Tree wakes up in the morning, in the same dorm as before, and the previous day's events repeat, unnerved Tree relives the same day again, but avoids the tunnel. Instead she returns to the sorority house for her party, Tree enjoys herself and quickly hooks up with her classmate Nick Sims (Blaine Kern III), but the masked killer is there, he murders Nick, then kills her. Tree is terrified to find herself repeating events all over again, she is trapped in a time loop, she avoids her death this time by barricading herself in her room, but she is murdered again when the killer was hiding in the bathroom. During the next loop, Tree tells her story to Carter, he suggests she take advantage of the loop, make a list of all the suspects to figure out who is trying to kill her, she spends the next few loops following suspected students, all of which end up with her murdered as she stalks the wrong person each time. Tree also takes advantage of her situation and enjoys the reactions of everyone seeing her walk around the campus completely naked. On the next loop, Tree passes out following her previous death, being bludgeoned by a baseball bat, she is taken to hospital where she finds she has retained damaged from her other murders. Then she finds herself chased by the killer again through the hospital, until she escapes in Butler's car, while driving at high speed she is pulled over by a police officer, she volunteers to be arrested to avoid being killed, however the killer shows up and blows her up with leaking gas and a match. Waking up in Carter's bedroom again, Tree convinces him of the predicament knowing a number of events before they happen, going to a restaurant, she admits she doesn't like who she's become, including being distant from her father, since the death of her mother three years ago, they shared the same birthday. Tree sees the local news broadcast report, that serial killer Joseph Tombs (Rob Mello) is being held in the hospital, she concludes he is the masked killer. Tree races to the hospital to warn of Tombs' escape, the killer breaks free and nearly kills her, Carter follows and ends up killed by Tombs, Tree is chased into the bell tower, realising Carter will remain dead if she doesn't restart the loop, she hangs her from the tower. During the next loop, Tree spends her time righting the various wrongs she has caused, ending her affair with Dr. Butler, and meeting her father David (Jason Bayle) to resolve their situation. That night, Tree prepares to stop Tombs, he has the upper hand, but uses the knowledge of a blackout to disarm him and shoot him to death, she relieved to finally be free, and celebrates her birthday in her room, eating Lori's cupcake. However, the next morning, Tree is horrified to be waking up on her birthday again, killing Tombs did not stop the time loop, she is distraught and returns to her room to run away. Lori is there to offer her the cupcake again, Tree realises she died in her sleep, she never consumed the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

cupcake before, she realises Lori is the real killer, the cupcake is poisoned, and had access to Tombs with her job in the hospital. Lori confesses that she was jealous of Dr. Butler having an interest in Tree, the two fight, Tree manages to stuff the cupcake into Lori's mouth, before kicking her out of the window, she falls to her death. Tree and Carter reflect on the day's events back at the restaurant, he offer her his room for the night, and comments that her situation is the movie Groundhog Day. Tree wakes up the next morning, she believes she is in another loop when the first few events repeat, but then Carter tells her it is Tuesday 19th September, he pranked her, she is mad for a moment, but then they relax and kiss. Also starring Rachel Matthews as Danielle Bouseman, Phi Vu as Ryan Phan, Laura Clifton as Stephanie Butler and Ramsey Anderson as Keith Lumbly. Rothe is well cast as the college student who has so many flaws that there are plenty of people who would want to kill her, the time loop format has been done before in various genres, thrillers like Source Code and sci-fi like Edge of Tomorrow, this is one of the first in the scary movie category. It is not really that scary, it has the odd small jump and creepy element, but it is very witty, satirical with the campus setting, and making obvious jokes about its own slasher movie format, it is just an enjoyable popcorn movie and crowd pleaser, perfect if celebrating your birthday as well, a fun horror. Good!

7

What was so fun with the horror movies in the 90s was how they made people unlikable before giving us the joy of murdering them. The actress was incredible at being unbearable, I was excited to see her be killed... repeatedly.

I was disappointed by the lack of gore, but then I appreciated it as a clever suspense. And it sure delivered. She powerfully expressed her psychological distress.

It was very fun, movies that laugh at themselves are the best comedies. It was actually deep and inspiring too about personal maturity and social interactions.

Seeing her relive the same day didn't feel repetitive, she doesn't just make different choices, her attitude becomes different too. I wasn't expecting much, but even when I do, I rarely get twists and endings this interesting. I'll gladly watch again!

I'm happy that more movies are using the Groundhog Day idea. Edge of Tomorrow was also interesting if you like science fiction.

6

Happy Death Day Review By Jordan Whitten

Plot: A college student must relive the day of her murder over and over again, in a loop that will end only when she discovers her killer's identity.

Although the concept and idea was a copy of Groundhog day, it

turned

out to be a thrilling, mysterious and intense film with loads of drama and action. However, does that make it a good movie? I guess we'll find out more in this review of Happy Death Day.

The first thing I will say about this movie is that it is more funnier than scary. So if you're not a big fan of scary horror movies, there is literally nothing to be afraid of. You only encounter really 1 jump scare which is debatably scary, whether you are faint-hearted/timid person you would be quite frightened.

The movie Happy Death Day featured the main character Tree Gelbman (Jessica Rothe) and secondary main characters: Carter Davis (Israel Broussard), Lori Spengler (Ruby Modine), and Gregory Butler (Charles Aitken). Without a doubt the acting was great. Few errors were spotted throughout the whole motion picture. So no complaints there.

Other than that, the film felt like it was dragging on forever and it was never going to end. Considering it kept showing the same scenes over and over again which gradually got boring. Just when you think Tree might live to the next day, she doesn't, and that could really get you on your nerves and it frustrated me at one point in the movie. However, at the end of the movie when Tree finally discovered who her murderer is, I felt so relieved. After all the build up it all turned out to be quite useful in the end. It made the audience feel ecstatic. The film really keeps you guessing who the murderer is, I think it is an excellent movie in the mystery genre. I urged to discover who the killer was, I think it was it was killing me more than it was killing tree.

In conclusion, I personally think the movie is good, not great or amazing but just plain good. There were a couple faults I found in the movie, but there was also some really good things that happened in the film. It also shares some life lessons which is kinda neat. If you are going to see this motion picture, do not expect it to be a full on horror movie that will keep you on your feet. Although it does seem that away in the trailer, it's actually a really fun movie with Jessica Rothe saying a few funny jokes here and there. Happy Death Day is nothing that I expected it to be and I like that, hopefully you do too.

Personal Rating: 6.4/10 Is it worth watching: YES

6

'HAPPY DEATH DAY' - 2017

Directed by Christopher B Landon{Scouts Guide to the Zombie Apocalypse}

Starring Jessica Rothe{La La Land} and Israel Broussard{Flipped}

Plot Overview: ​When a young University student awakens in the dormitory of a complete stranger, she must move through her day until she inevitably gets killed off. The catch? She must relive this same fate ever day until she can stop the seemingly omnipotent and omnipresent killer.

Going into this film, I expected a low rent slasher with a silly premise that I could write of a garbage. Well it certainly wasn't that.

I was pleasantly surprised with this movie. It's a very fun Halloween movie. Don't go into it expecting the next big thing in terms of horror, go in expecting a fun comedy with horror elements and I think that you'll enjoy this movie very much.

What can I say that I liked about this movie, specifically? Well the tone was excellent. At the start, very few of the jokes hit for me so I got a little bit worried. But as the film progressed, it became a genuinely good comedy. I tend to like Horror-Comedies because I don't like the feeling of being scared, and thus a joke or two helps calm me down. The way they blend the two genres in this movie is almost effortless. It definitely leans a little more onto the comedy aspect than horror, which will definitely turn off those who EXPECTED this to be a horror movie. It's maybe a 1/4 horror movie, 3/4 comedy? The creepy and jumpy moments worked, but they were infrequent. With the exception of ONE, jump scares were also non existent in this movie. Thank the lord God for that! But to be fair, the one that they DO use was pretty effective and worked well. So as a whole, the tone for this movie was pretty darn excellent.

Another aspect of this movie that absolutely deserves praise, is Jessica Rothe's performance as a Tree. Sorry, the character's name is Tree; the character is unfortunately not a tree. She is, actually, far from it. Most horror movies just substitute in a stereotype of a character and expect that to work but this movie doesn't. She's the pretty girl but she's also the deluded, sociopath. Seriously! At the start of this movie, the character Tree is about as likable as the plant one. But Rothe portrayed this character undeniably well. Even in the latter half of the movie, she portrays the character exceptionally well and really sells the character's growth.

Another actor who appears in this movie was Israel Broussard. Broussard also gives an excellent performance as Carter. Not only that, but I also REALLY buy the romance between Tree and Carter. It doesn't feel forced in the slightest and that is rare for a movie nowadays. It usually feels wrong when two characters get together in a movie because I just cannot see it happening in real life. But thankfully, I did buy their relationship, and found it to be a very fun and goofy one to watch.

Alas, I do definitely have some flaws with this movie. The final 15 minutes and the grand reveal were my two main issues. I won't spoil either of course, so you can still enjoy this film. But personally, I found the final 15 minutes of this movie to be COMPLETELY unnecessary. So much so that I was getting ready to leave at the climax of the scene before that because I thought the film was over. But no. They drag it on an extra 15 minutes and reveal what I predicted to happen. Which was my second issue. I predicted the ending BUT only because I was paying REALLY close attention to a scene and, while it may have been accidental, they reveal the ending by use of a prop. This may be just me being smart and interpreting it a weird way, or it may have been intentional, in which case then well done to those who were in charge of that. It was a very clever way to reveal it, and the people I saw

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

this film with didn't catch on and I had to tell them about it afterwards. Despite that, I did figure it out so I can't really credit the reveal as being that good.

Something that personally didn't bother me but will bother other people, is the fact that this is not a horror movie by definition. It has elements of horror movies, yes. But it is still technically a comedy movie, which is NOT what the trailers suggested at all. So I can completely understand if horror fans felt misled, therefore I do think that they should've either completely changed the marketing campaign OR included a LOT more horror elements and creepy scenes.

But aside from those flaws, I found this to be a very enjoyable movie. It isn't going to win any awards but I can see it gaining a cult following. It was certainly fun and entertaining and I will definitely recommend you go and see it. I'll rate 'Happy Death Day' 6 'Creepy Masks' out of 10!

6

The premise of this film is what gives it 4 of the 6 stars I have given. It's actually a really smart plot, yet it is executed rather poorly, which is such a shame considering that if the film took itself a little more seriously, it could genuinely be put into contention as one of the great Psychological Thrillers of recent years. That is the problem, it's more "fun" than "thrilling".

The story and ingenuity start to slow down as the film goes on, with both gently coming to a halt by the final 10 minutes of the film, so it's a downward slope from (pretty much) the start but it does manage to cling on to its entertainment value long enough to be worth watching.

Don't expect a masterpiece, it's just a bit of fun.

10

If you've seen Groundhog Day and Before I fall, then you should roughly know what the movie is about. The story-line is superb for it is a comedy and horror and whodunit movie all rolled into one. This is Jessica Rothe's second movie that I have seen, the Tribe being the other one. Yes I have not seen La La Land, because I hate musicals. Suffice to say Rothe is one of those actors who play their roles very convincingly. I am glad the test audience reacted furiously to the original ending of the movie and the director opted for the alternative ending. I enjoyed it therefore I recommend it. A nice change to typical Halloween season movies!

10

This movie has to be my favorite movie so far. The movie has a really great meaning to it, it's just like Groundhog Day and Scream in one

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

movie. This movie is scary, I loved the feel of the sound effects and stuff. The jump scares were great. After the movie I went home and I could not get to sleep, I actually woke up and thought it was the same day.

Overall the movie was the best movie I have ever seen yet.

If I could only rate 11/10.....

8

Went to movie theater with low expectations, but this movie surprised me!

I would not classify this movie as Horror/Mystery/Thriller, but as a Comedy with horror elements - it was funny, i liked all characters and plot twists.

I would definitely recommend watching it – film was executed very well
and kept me entertained the whole time!

6

Happy Death Day is a movie about a university student who, on her birthday, manages to get killed by an unknown masked person. After the experience, she wakes up and realizes that she is reliving said day. While she is repeating this process, she decides to begin tracking down the person who is repeatedly slaughtering her.

Now going into this movie I didn't really expect that much. A horror movie such as this one simply looked like one where jumpscare would be very common. To an extent, I was right; there were a lot of jumpscare in this film and only a couple were effective. The first one, for instance was effective because you couldn't see it coming, but they stopped being effective directly afterwards because I had an idea where the plot was going to go with every repeated day. In a way, the movie fails at being a horror due to its predictability. This movie also has some major plot holes that I would discuss, but that would dive into spoiler territory.

As for the stuff that I enjoyed in the film, it does get entertaining sometimes and many of the jokes were pretty funny. The relationships between the main character, the love interest and the dad eventually began to grow on me. If there's one thing that the movie somewhat succeeds in as a horror, it's the fact that it does deal with some of the repercussions of fear and what it can do to one's body and that's kind of scary when you think about it.

Overall I really did enjoy this movie when it felt more like a dramedy.
However, when it turns back into a horror film, for the most part Happy Death Day turns into an ineffective horror movie that is intended on using predictable jumpscare as a means to scare people, leaving that aspect of the films very weak.

6/10

7

Movie with the time loop concept is interesting but really need many

good elements in it. It must contain good story, morale message, and also the brilliant plot twist is a must. And what makes this movie great ? Yeah it because Happy Death Day has all of the important element. Simple story with popular girl in university, with good directing, the repeated scene because of time loop doesn't seem boring. They can make the audience to be curious and sometimes with extra comedy it makes this film really great !

No doubt you will like this horror thriller movie because it is not similar like usual horror movie with some ghost, devil, or mysterious phenomenon. Its more like thriller movie with mysterious psychopath that kills you and you just cant escape from it. Even if I think this movie is brilliant, I admit that with this film concept like this, I like better if the movie genre is drama because it can offer you much more emotional, dramatic, and better morale message.

6

Groundhog Day had an arrogant man trapped in a small town on the same day until he learned to appreciate those around him. Edge of Tomorrow had Tom Cruise repeating an alien invasion until he could figure a way to win it. Today's movie has someone repeating not just their birthday, but the day that they are killed by a psychopath. I've mentioned before that on paper, time loop stories are a great way to get to know the person suffering the consequence of reliving the day. On camera, the trick is harder as the story has to remain consistent without being too repetitive.

The idea of someone having to repeat their birthday is an interesting one, considering that the older one gets, the less they care about the day that celebrates that. It may be a morose notion, but it's about the college age in which people would rather draw attention on the celebration rather than the number factor. I myself celebrated my thirtieth by taking a vacation and having dinner with the family. The movie not only gives us a character who could care less that she has a birthday, but an extra layer that I won't give away. So Happy Death Day may have a little extra for the time loop story.

A snobbish college girl Theresa (played by Jessica Rothe) wakes up in the dorm room of fellow student Carter (played by Israel Broussard). Though he tries to make small talk, she leaves to go back to her sorority. She spends the day being rude and pretentious to everyone including her roommate Lori. She's also the other girl in an affair with her professor and even ignores her father's invitation to a birthday lunch. On her way to a party, she is stalked by a hooded figure wearing her school's mascot image as a mask. She is killed but wakes up the same morning in the same dorm room of Carter.

She initially dismisses the previous night as a dream and goes on her day again only to get killed. When she realizes she's repeating the same day over and over, she's suggested to use that time to follow potential suspects. Each day ends in death and summons her back to the

beginning, but the twist is that with each day, she is growing weaker from the injuries. So despite the safety of the time loop, there seems to be a clock that is getting closer to midnight as Theresa is trying to solve her murder.

The whole time loop formula has been done before, but I like how Happy

Death Day has used it in a horror context. Did it generate a scary movie? Well… I'd say that while it's shot in a suspenseful tone, it doesn't generate that many scares. I'd argue that the tone is not even full horror, but I'll get to that in a moment. But going back to it's use on the time loop, I think they did it well. I also like that they establish that her body is still vulnerable to damage from the murders, otherwise it would seem like there were no consequence.

I'll say that I really enjoyed Jessica Rothe in the lead. For someone who initially has to start the film in an unlikable manner, she carries the story and really makes you want to see her redeem herself.

What the marketing seems to hide is that Happy Death Day is a part comedy. While I'm no sure why the trailers didn't want to spoil that notion, but I laughed more then I thought I was going. Because the film is still trying to be scary, it does suffer from inconsistency. I think it would have made sense to try and be a little more funny, something in the vein of Evil Dead or Drag Me to Hell. That would at least justify the PG-13 rating that is hindering this story of it's full potential. Those hoping for a lot of blood are not going to see it. I'll also bet that the film war originally produced with an R rating, only to get cut down to try and get in a teenage audience. Come on! Teenagers are already aware of these kinds of college dangers. They would have been fine with an R rating.

I'll give this six red birthday candles out of ten. Happy Death Day feels like a great movie that was edited by cowards who thought they knew what was best. I doubt ill see this again as it is, but I'll be on the lookout for a directors cut. Maybe that'll add back in that extra violence and jokes that are apparently too much for the studio

10

Denis Villeneuve, you magnificent world wonder, you did it again!

I have seen this film three times in the cinema, in 3D, 2D and 4DX.

And one of the things i have noticed with this film, is that it's not the time in the cinema that takes up my time, It's the hours upon hours in between spent thinking about the film, that is the real time consumer. This film left such a deep and profound impact, which i cannot escape. And I've gone back to the cinema twice to be "tortured", but it's worth it.

It's a dark, mysterious, grim, hopeless, sad and lonely film, set in a possible near future where the human race is hanging by their fingertips on the edge of doom. So it's quite depressing. But it's so brilliantly put together, the closest master of cinema i think of that

has done something similar, is Stanley Kubrick. Many Stanley Kubrick films were also hated by many when they first released. 2001: A Space Odyssey for example, which had gorgeous visuals, but felt flat and hollow for many, even professional reviewers back then. But what Kubrick did best with his films, was to create afterthought. People left the cinema feeling confused and even depressed, but the movies planted a seed which then grew for years. The original Blade Runner also accomplished this. BR2049 is no exception, this movie will without doubt live on to be interpreted, analyzed and discussed for decades to come. The story continues from the original, but stands completely on its own, it tells a new story that directly interlink with the original, but without trying to be a copy, it's a natural continuation in the same universe. You don't have to see the original Blade Runner first, though i do recommend it, see the final cut.

BR2049 has some of the most gorgeous visuals i have ever seen, and the cinematography is out of this world, there is literally no excuse not to give Roger Deakins the Oscar this time. After 13 nominations he has now knocked the ball out of the park and is this year in his own league entirely. It's confusing to look at something so gorgeous, whilst painting a picture of such a sad and lost world. It sort of collides with your senses, your eyes say it's beautiful, your mind say it's depressing. Which senses are you going to believe? What does it mean? At least don't confuse feeling depressed as a sign that this movie is bad, it's nothing wrong feeling depressed, take it in, embrace it. Then you will know how it feels to be a replicant that's trapped in a caged mind.

BR2049's story happens 30 years after the original, and there is three short films on Youtube i recommend you watch. These short films describes some of what happened in between 2019 and 2049. Watching them makes it slightly easier to understand some of the things going on. But the underlying theme is the same as it was in the original. What does it mean to be human? What does it mean to have memories? What is a soul? And so on.

The world has gone darker in 2049, climate is spinning out of control, almost all animals and plants have died. People are desperate and lost, law enforcement can barely keep anything together, and only a small spark can set of total disaster, which is looming just around every corner. Niander Wallace has taken over Tyrell Corp and has by the time 2049 takes place designed millions of obedient replicants that does exactly what he tells them to do. But there is one thing Wallace has not been able to perfect, and that's what the main story is all about, and Wallace will do anything in his power to get his hands on the technology, which will result in him becoming many hundred times richer and more powerful, the sole ruler of the entire universe. He is so far gone in his mind by 2049 he actually believes he is god himself, and he calls his replicants angels.

And of course he also uses replicants to do his dirty work. In 2049 we meet his right hand girl; Luv (Brilliantly played by Sylvia Hoeks,

if there is one actor in this movie that steal the show, it's her). Luv is a "handygirl"; so to speak, that perform whatever task she is set to do, with no remorse. Or is that entirely true? I can't spoil anything, but look closely at Luv's character arc. All the other actors also do an outstanding job in this film, no bad performances, but i can't talk about all of them due to the word limit in these reviews.

Be prepared going to see this film, it's depressing and heavy on your mind, and it demands your full attention. It's one of those rare films who dares to challenge the audience, and by doing so, taking a huge risk, and a 155 million dollar risk at that. The film isn't perfect, but it's close, and it shows the tremendous skills of Denis Villeneuve. And those few mistakes this movie have, are probably just happy little accidents as Rob Ross would have put it. This film is very much like a painting, every stroke of the brush matters, and every little detail is carefully crafted, it takes monumental skills to pull it off.

I loved this film, it's the best film I've seen all year, It is a must see, a monumental triumph of a film that's just as good (possibly even better) as the original and one of the best sequels of all time!

9.7/10 - Masterpiece

And BTW Villeneuve's next movie might be Dune, imagine if he brings Deakins and the rest of this team to make that movie. Yeah, I'm going to leave you with that thought. This is basically porn.

10

Let me start by saying that I am a huge Denis Villeneuve fan and absolutely love every movie he made, from his breakthrough drama "Incendies"; to the action thriller "Sicario";. But when I learned that he was going to make a sequel to Ridley Scott's iconic Blade Runner I had mixed feelings. Would he be able to live up to the expectations and make a sequel that could measure itself with the original? For this reason, I went into the cinema thinking "This will be a great movie, I am a Villeneuve fan so I have to like it"; but that was a mistake, for once I stopped expecting and just started experiencing the film, I was enchanted by all of its visual beauty. I was wrong to doubt Villeneuve; his "Blade Runner 2049"; even succeeds in transcending in some ways the original masterpiece, especially as a visual experience.

The bleak dystopian future Scott so perfectly created is even more beautiful in Villeneuve's 2049, for which a lot of credit has to be given to the brilliant director of photography Roger Deakins, who has made one of his best works (which says a lot). Every shot is brilliant, I loved every single frame and I cannot imagine that he wouldn't get nominated and win an Oscar for this phenomenal work. But also a big thumbs up has to be given to the entire effects team, for Deakins didn't do it all on his own.

Deakins isn't the only mastermind at work, for the score is also beautifully done. When I learned that composer Johann Johannsson

(someone who has collaborated multiple times with Villeneuve and did most of the scores for his movies) got fired I was surprised; Johansson has always delivered great work, but according to Villeneuve, his score wasn't the right one; for this movie for it didn't resemble Vangelis soundtrack for Blade Runner; quite enough. So he got replaced by probably the best man in the business nowadays; Hans Zimmer. And as we are used to with the German composer, this was once again sublime and a great homage to the original. Zimmer's 2049 score can be compared to his Dunkirk score, in a way that it unsettles us from the first chord and just as the Second World War movie, it keeps us on the edges of our seats, especially during the last hour. As for the people who are actually situated in front of the camera, they all play their parts very well. I was especially happy that Ryan Gosling's agent K was indeed the leading man and he did a very good job. I was slightly concerned that it would mostly be about Harrison Ford's Deckard, but luckily that wasn't the case. Nevertheless, Ford gives one of his best performances in years and after all the iconic roles he played once again in recent years (Han Solo, Indiana Jones) this is by far the best. The smaller but important roles are also noteworthy; Robin Wright's Lieutenant Joshi makes a fierce and convincing police chief, while the villain duo Jared Leto's Neander Wallace as the evil head of a corporation at the top of the new world order and his frightening hit-woman Luv (Sylvia Hoeks) are also very impressive. Last but not least, Ana de Armas is also very good as Joi, K's girlfriend (even if she does remind me a lot of Scarlet Johansson in Her; and slightly of Alicia Vikander in Ex Machina; but maybe that's something Villeneuve did that on purpose and wanted to pay homage to these recent but also very good science-fiction movies). That said, Villeneuve will receive most of the credit, as he should. For unlike most of Hollywood's blockbusters nowadays, he doesn't simply deliver us a spectacle with some nice effects or a reboot of the original, but he picks up the threads where Scott left, which was a monumental task, for the original Blade Runner; is one of the most impressive and iconic movies ever made. 2049 continues on the same topics raised by the original, making the sequel worth the 35-year long wait; it goes further with what was proposed in the first installment, enriching one another. It is possible that one day a third installment could be made, but that is only if any director will ever find the courage to make another Blade Runner; for the bar is raised incredibly high. I believe that in time, Blade Runner 2049; will just as the original one, grow into a cult movie, and rightfully so, for it is its own movie, but, just as the original, a visually remarkable, achingly human sci-fi masterpiece. I am not going to say more about it, because the studio has been unusually insistent in its pleas to critics and the first movie viewers

not to reveal any plot points, but I am glad they did. Even if I could go on and on about the movie and the difference between replicants and humans (or is there really much of a difference, after all?) the less you know the better, because 2049 feels at its best when it surprises (which is one of Villeneuve's greatest strengths). This is a movie best experienced on the biggest screen in your cinema; trust me, it will be worth your while. As for me, I will most likely try and make some free time in my schedule for the coming days, 'cause I want to go the cinema again, guess what I'm gonna watch...

10

For film fanatics like myself, Blade Runner 2049 is a great film for people to see, regardless if they've witnessed the original or not. On the other hand, if you've never seen the original Blade Runner and are just a casual moviegoer that have thought of the promotion for this film as being an action-packed thrill ride, then I'd have to warn to stay far away from this near three hour motion picture. It's very hard to review this film without getting into specific plot details, but that's exactly what makes this film worth the price of admission alone. For nearly every reason a film fan should be excited about a movie, here is why Blade Runner 2049 is a must see as soon as possible.

Before dropping you into this world with Ryan Gosling's character, there is text at the beginning that will fill you in on the history of the events in the past, but even though that information is given to you, your experience just won't be the same without having viewed the first film multiple times and remembering the emotional core of it. Set out on a mission to find something of meaning to the overall story, Ryan Gosling's character (who will remain nameless for the sake of this review) uncovers mysteries and secrets from the past, inevitably involving Rick Deckard. Quite honestly, that's the plot in a nutshell and the specifics of the film will lead to ruining your experience, so let's get technical.

If not for anything else, Blade Runner 2049 benefits from some of the best cinematography I've laid my eyes on in years. From the addition of the seamlessly blended visual effects, to the mind- blowing scenery constructed by the entire art department, I have nothing but praise for this film. Whether or not you find yourself enjoying your experience, the visuals alone should have you applauding, due to their incredibly detailed nature. I personally found the overall film to be magnificent, but when certain scenes were dialogue-free and asking you to gasp at the imagery, that's exactly what I was doing, as I feel many audiences members will.

Again, without giving anything away, once Rick Deckard (Harrison Ford) enters the picture, the way both films sort of interconnect was brilliant in my opinion. It does justice to any loose ends that fans may have wanted in the past, as well as create a new story to gawk at in the process. With a terrifically restrained performance by Ryan

Gosling, you'll find yourself sucked into this world as a fly on the wall, as he uncovers these mysteries. With the addition of Harrison Ford giving one of his most sincere and memorable performances, as well as Ana de Armas in a role that really took me by surprise, this film was casted to the nines from beginning to end. Some may complain about Jared Leto and Dave Bautista not being included as much, but I felt as though they served the story quite nicely.

In the end, this movie aims to impress Sci-Fi fans across the world, but I feel as though the people who will be looking back on this as a possible classic or at least one of the best sequels ever made, are those who've had the pleasure of indulging in the greatness that is 1982's Blade Runner. I don't say this about films very often, especially when talking about sequels, but I haven't been this immersed in a theatrical experience in quite some time. This is definitely a superior film than the original, it's one of the best films of 2017, and I'll be revisiting it very soon. Blade Runner 2049 is getting a lot of praise and awards consideration from critics and filmgoers across the world, and every bit of it is deserved. Aside from being very long, this is pretty much a perfect film if you don't try to nitpick how it connects and certain questions that aren't blatantly answered. If you know what type of film you're in for, or you've at least seen the original and enjoyed it, I can't recommend this movie enough.

10

Blade Runner 2049 is the sequel to the 1982 sci-fi classic Blade Runner. Directed by Denis Villeneuve (Arrival, Sicario) and once again based on Philip K. Dick's novel Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?, it successfully recaptures just about everything excellent about the original and is a superb sequel to one of the greatest and most important science fiction films of all time.

Thirty years after the events of the first film, LAPD Officer K (Ryan Gosling) works as a Blade Runner, retiring old rogue replicants (artificial humans) hiding out around the Los Angeles area. One day while on a job, K discovers a long buried secret in the yard of a replicant which leads him on a journey to track down former Blade Runner Rick Deckard (Harrison Ford), who has been missing for decades.

Featuring amazing visuals and some of the most philosophical and thought-provoking themes since the original, Blade Runner 2049 is a masterpiece of science fiction and is possibly one of the greatest sequels ever made. I was transfixed the entire time, to the point where I felt that even blinking would cause me to miss something I wanted to see. The cast was brilliant as well, especially Ryan Gosling, who does a fantastic job carrying the film as its lead actor. However, perhaps best of all, is that seeing the original is not a requirement to fully understand everything that is going on, although it would probably still help to have done so beforehand. I'm almost certain that author Philip K. Dick would be proud of this film. I know I am.

I rate it a very

high 9.5/10

3

I never was one of those people asking for a Blade Runner sequel. Now that Blade Runner 2049 is out, my position still stands. This film is simply a massive letdown and nothing more.

The year is 2049 and the world has grown in technology, but not humanity. Ryan Gosling plays K, a Blade Runner (a futuristic cop) tasked with tracking down the last of the Replicants-androids that look like humans. Knowing that he himself is a replicant, he goes on a journey of his own when he finds a box containing the bones of a Replicant who gave birth to a child and is tasked with finding the child. Little does he know that the new head of the Tyrell Corporation that makes the Replicants, Mr. Wallace (Jared Leto), plans to use the missing child for his own purposes and kill K if he has to.

My main problem with the film is that it was unforgivably boring. The film is two hours and forty-five minutes long, which is already enough to test one's patience (and bladder), but it feels so deliberately paced; the characters almost always move so slow, that it feels like the filmmakers thought that it was the best way to pad out the running time, despite having not enough material to justify it.

The performances range from great to laughable. Harrison Ford is hardly in the movie, and his inclusion is clearly a marketing ploy, but he gives the best performance in his brief running time and he feels like a continuation of his character from the original, Deckard, in a world where things have just gotten worse. Gosling isn't bad as K, and his stone-face actually is pretty effective in a couple of scenes, but Rutger Hauer in the original gave his Replicant character more of a personality. Leto is trying and failing to bring a degree of menace as the villain, and his female Replicant sidekick competes with him in the field of phoning it in.

What else shocked me was how unsubtle the film was. The original was not only a futuristic crime noir that had Harrison Ford's Deckard chasing down androids, but also a personal journey involving himself and Rutger Hauer as the villain that involved trying to find a degree of humanity in such a futuristic world, and that maybe, Deckard is a replicant himself. Here, the story is mainly of Gosling trying to come to terms with the fact that he is a Replicant and what it means in terms of his humanity. Whereas in the original, there were subtle signs, images, and bits of dialogue that hinted at Deckard's purpose in the original, everything is spelled out for the audience to the point that old bits of dialogue are repeated thrice at important moments. It doesn't respect the audience's intelligence at all. The first and final thirds of the film are mainly filled with dialogue that is basically speeches that preach ideas about conflict and the ethics of machines, but hardly any of it is explored in an interesting fashion. What's worse, the film feels so empty and devoid that for a time, I forgot

what K's objective was.

What I will say is that the cinematography is beautiful. There are a lot of colorful images with ancient ruins and futuristic tech in the background and foreground that could easily pass as being part of an art gallery. The only downside is that there is too much gray in some shots and it feels too clean compared to the original.

Why Warner Brothers and Sony wasted their time making this film, I have no clue. Maybe it was Ridley Scott's fault. After being unimpressed with his Alien: Covenant earlier this year (and was also quite the snooze-fest), watching this only proved to me further that Scott just doesn't care about good filmmaking anymore. Denis Villeneuve is clearly an ambitious director, but his style didn't feel completely right for this film. Clearly, in a film that tries so desperately to say much more humanity than its predecessor, it comes out feeling empty and feels less human than the original did.

P.S. A lot of people have accused me of being too shallow and wanting this film to be more action packed. I do not have that mindset. I enjoy films that take their time as much as the next film enthusiast, but this one just didn't do enough to justify what it was aiming for. I'm not ashamed in expressing my opinion. Just let me be clear on something: going at a slow, deliberate pace and speaking lines of preachy dialogue does not, I repeat, does not equal intelligence. The positive reviews baffle me, especially on Rotten Tomatoes. Sony owns the company, which leads me to think that maybe it bribed more than a few critics in the hopes that more people would see it. Clearly, that is backfiring and I'm happy that people are rejecting it.

3

In 1982 I was deeply excited about the prospect of seeing "Blade Runner," and can remember applying for a chance to see an advance showing in Sacramento. From the start it seemed obvious that it was a special film--clouded in controversy and mystery. Later I acquired my much-viewed VHS copy, with all the eye-gouging, nail-puncturing violence. Later still the Internet provided background information as, eventually, did articles plus a comprehensive book by Paul M. Sammon. In short, I am a fan, and was eagerly anticipating the sequel.

So, it was with disappointment that I left an October 6, 2017 showing "Blade Runner 2049." Overly long, boring, poorly paced, and confusing were my initial impressions, though admittedly it was beautifully filmed (potential Oscar nomination in cinematography?).

I appreciated the many (too many?) subtle and not-so-subtle nods to the original film, the effort to build on the "Blade Runner" universe, and efforts by writers, directors, and actors to bring the story to life. But there were just too many scenes that should have been reduced in length from 25-50% of their run time. Such excess in a film is, to me, almost always a fatal flaw. And some scenes (e.g., where characters "Joi" and "Mariette" merge to make love to "K") could

have been cut

altogether, I feel, without harming the story.

The acting was satisfactory or better, for the most part, as one would

expect from the level of supporting talent.* However, I have knowingly seen two pictures starring Ryan Gosling's 2016's <La La Land>; and now

this;and in both he is bland and wooden. Despite the fact that <2049>;

<K>; is SUPPOSED to be a self-controlled, artificial humanoid, I wonder if it is just Gosling's natural on- (and off-) screen persona. And frankly, Harrison Ford's <Deckard>; just did not work for me.

Sacrilegious, I know; but true. I blame this on two factors.

First, Ford appears (too) late in the movie, by which time I was

already exhausted by tedium. Second, for a character without appearance-changing makeup, a dramatic accent, say, or pronounced behavioral distinctions, it is hard not to just see Harrison Ford.

(Kind of like Robert Redford miscast in 1985's <Out of Africa>.) Oh, it's (old) Harrison Ford again. Sorry HF fans everywhere.

And another thing; due to poor direction, they included <Admiral

William Adama>; (Edward James Olmos) from TV's <Battlestar Galactica>;

and not <Gaff>; (also Olmos), in a too brief cameo. (Listen to <Gaff>; in

the 1982 original. Totally different voicing.)

Like most films, it suffered from its share of <Oh, come on!>; moments.

Why would 6-foot <K>; allow 6-foot-6 Dave Bautista's imposing <Sapper

Morton>; to make the first move (and thus begin the accumulation of a ridiculous amount of damage, most of it unnecessary, sustained by <K>;

throughout the story)? Because that's what movie detectives do. I must say, <K>; apparently likes to pass violently through solid walls (a nod to Rutger Hauer's <Roy Batty>; head in the original, I take

it).

Almost all action-adventure films are silly in hindsight and full of movie plot cliché's;

<Blade Runner 2049>; is no exception. But the test

of a good movie is whether the story flows at a pace that makes audiences subconsciously accept and even relish these otherwise

nonsensical encumbrances (see 1999's <The Matrix>). For my part I was less inclined to give <2049>; a pass on the silliness due to its

plodding nature.

Ridley Scott is prominently associated with both the recent <Alien>; and

<Blade Runner>; franchises, and has promised multiple sequels. Do we want this? Is state-of-the-art movie-making worth either ridiculously poor

stories (the <Alien>; franchise) or bad plotting and editing (<Blade Runner 2049>)? It's admittedly hard to make a good movie, but Scott and

his people are paid a LOT of money to do so. Check Scott's IMDb filmography. Can any mortal be involved first-hand in that many

projects? As with Stephen King, maybe it's time to stop the quantity

and re-focus on the quality? Just saying…

In conclusion, my disappointment focused primarily on the script and editing.**

Some recommendations to potential viewers: First, if you plan to see "Blade Runner 2049"; it will help to see one of 37 versions (e.g., voice-over or no voice-over?; graphic violence shots or not?) of the original 1982 film beforehand. Second, maybe wait to watch the movie digitally, so that you can re-play key scenes and increase volume on important dialogue. In the theater I kept mentally reaching for a non-existent remote control. Third, (after Recommendation One) if like me you hold the original picture in deep admiration as a flawed but intriguing analog masterpiece of SF movie-making, consider skipping this sequel altogether. But I imagine that warning will fall on deaf ears.

* Because of the look and feel of two female characters in the film, I wonder if actresses Felicity Jones ("Rogue One") and Tatiana Maslany ("Orphan Black") were originally considered for the parts eventually played by Ana de Armas (companion hologram "Joi") and Sylvia Hoeks (deadly replicant "Luv"). While watching the trailer footage, I originally mistook those two characters for actresses Jones and Maslany. Their doppelgangers did just fine, though. Hoeks' "Luv" is particularly chilling.

** Oh, and the music! Not so good. Too often I was aware of background music--that by itself is not a good thing--and its shortcomings. So much so that by the end of "2049," where original "Blade Runner" music ("Tears in the Rain," I think) is (finally) used, it left me with mixed feelings. First, thank god! Second, where was that musical excellence during the rest of the film? Music can make or break a film, and is incredibly important. Few excellent films have poor musical soundtracks. Unfortunately, "Blade Runner 2049" is not an exception to that guideline.

5

...the return of the giant Atarisign from the original Blade Runner.

OK, quick story synopsis. Bones found of a Replicant who's given birth. How was it possible and where is the child (now adult)?

I'm sorry, but having waited 35 years for this movie it just didn't press any buttons for me. It's an hour too long, the story-line is weak to non-existent and doesn't get answered, the theory of Deckard's origin is again teased at but not answered (even though there really is very little in the original to point to him being a replicant).

This is another SFX over substance movie. Looks good, although very dark in the 3D version, but there just doesn't seem to be the energy and edginess of the original. It all seems too NICE.

Having seen the original movie over 30 times, I'm not sure I'll bother returning to this new story. I have to agree with Rutger Hauer about

trying to add to a perfect movie.

3

The first movie (which should have stayed the only movie) is a masterpiece of sci fi. I was hooked from the start great story and for the time great FX also cannot beat the soundtrack by Vangelis.

Not sure what is going on with Ridley Scott first with is Alien Covenant he destroyed the series there and now with the new addition of blade runner.

I feel that all the positive reviews for this movie are fake, because the movie is a sad excuse to make money and makes no sense at all, no surprised it failed this weekend at the box office.

The acting is good so are the special effects, but the story is weak and none existent, Tyrell corporation is gone and there is a new company that makes the replicans, and tyrell had found a way for them to reproduce and have babies.

This is where the story gets weird, Deckard is brought back into the mix because he had a child with Rachel.

The movie also lack action and in the end does not explain anything. I felt like a huge waste of 2h and a half.

35y in the making for this wow just wow.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

1

The original Blade Runner is one of my favourite films so I was really looking forward to this one. What a disappointment. If I wasn't in the company of others I would of walked out early. I left the cinema feeling annoyed that I had to sit through this overlong monotonous film. The storyline is dragged out with the main character just going from place to place to investigate something like in a video game. At the beginning he is in a fight scene and you find out he is basically indestructible. The replicants are now terminators. This leaves out any suspense that he is in danger. The first film was kind of believable, the city was overcrowded and the building were decaying - it had atmosphere. This one looked like a more modern city with a lot of emptiness. The technology has advanced so much that he now has a solid light fully realistic AI holographic companion that operates from a small device he can keep in his pocket. If you think about it why are they so desperate to increase replicant slave labour production when they are capable of building AI robots that can be enveloped with holographic light to look human. They still have the blurry 1950 TV quality monitors to echo the first film but the supposed technology jump does not make sense. The music by Vangelis was one of the most important parts of the original. He conveyed through the use of synthesisers and traditional instruments a sense of awe and wonder, beauty and the sadness of a dystopian world. Johann Johansson was

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

originally commissioned to score the film and I think he would of done a great job but they decided for some reason it was not Hollywood sounding enough so they bought in Hans Zimmer. What a disaster. It might as well be the music from Batman VS Alien. Just lots of loud noise. The original was a box office failure that became a cult classic. This is just a failure.

2

SPOILERS ALERT: The biggest difference between 1982 masterpiece and this one is that in the first film everything is happening at a normal speed. In original movie people talk like they talk in real life, their move at perfectly normal, every day, common speed, it doesn't take them forever to finish the sentence, or to shape out a thought, and yet... somehow it all works perfectly together.

There's no way to know how will people (let alone robots) act or talk in thirty plus years, but if it is to be anything like in BR2049, I suspect it will be a pretty bleak and exhausting world.

From the moment one, everybody talks, walks, plays, runs in some super-strange slow-mo: I'd say at 50% of the normal speed. It takes 10 seconds for poor Ryan Gosling only to take out something from his pocket. Not to say how long it takes him to walk through the scene - so much that half way through, let's say, the orphanage part, I have already forgotten what is he doing there in the first place.

20 minutes into the movie, all I'm doing is wondering when this shot is going to end, when this scene is going to end, when the sequence will, and, ultimately, when the movie is going to end. This is not the way to pay a homage, to anybody or anything.

There is a reason why the shots in 2001 Odyssey... are that long, somebody should've warned the director about that. And there's also a reason why all shots in the original BR are that tight. And that's just one of the reasons to why both 2001 and BR are masterpieces. And for that same reason, BR2049 could that never be.

You don't drag out every single aspect of the movie just to make it seem serious or pretend to be an artist, no. If you do, you get very expensive, anemic boredom. I have no idea why the director did it - he hasn't done it in that fairly fair movie with Hugh Jackman. What possessed him to do it here? Was it the importance of the first movie? Was it his fear to look like a schoolboy in front of the Master? Don't know, don't care.

What a waste of great actors, class all - forcing them to engage in some sort of quasi elevated, quasi profound, but genuinely bizarre ballet that has nothing, nothing, nothing to do with the real life. The movie is three hours plus long only for the given reason - it would have been an hour shorter if had played out at normal pace.

Oh - and to end here - the biggest dread of all: a hint of a possible franchise. Please, please, please people, for the love of all that's holly. Don't.

Please be aware that my review contains spoilers so please do not read further if you do want to have key plot points revealed.

First things first, I'm a big fan of the original and have enjoyed immensely with each viewing, first from when I was a 10 year old until 2 weeks ago so I was interested to see what Villeneuve would do with the sequel.

Watched it Saturday and must say the experience left me somewhat underwhelmed and frustrated at seeing such an opportunity to do something original go to waste, that I have decided to post my thoughts here on IMDb for the first time.

In no particular here are some of my questions and general points about the film.

Jared Leto's performance. How the hell is he such a high paid star? I cannot think of anything he is particularly memorable and this is no exception.

His eyes. Are they distracting on purpose?

If his character saved the world from starvation, how come there aren't millions of people worshiping him? Humans are suckers for finding idols and why shouldn't his character be any different. Crikey, we have dictators in our world who had days and months of the year named after family members.

Why doesn't he have a massive army organised to hunt down Deckard instead of entrusting this to one replicant and a few goons?

Monologues giving exposition is lazy storytelling and old Wallace loves a monologue.

What is his plan? He wants to produce more replicants but kills one at the start for some spurious reason. Hint hint, to show the audience he is a very naughty. He also has the Rachel replicant killed. No wonder he cannot make enough replicants if he keeps killing them.

Ryan Gosling plays Ryan Gosling again and although I don't dislike his performances, I find it hard to root for his character here, as I've seen it before in a much better film (Drive).

The music wasn't particularly memorable and only made me think of the much better soundtrack from Bladerunner. Apparently this was intentional on Villeneuve's part as he removed the original composer who wanted to do something original. So instead, the director opted for Zimmer to make it more Bladerunnery and therefore less memorable for this film.

The film did not merit or need the run-time it had. I appreciate the original BR took its time but it had a new world to show us

The ending was goofy and ridiculous. Why would K bring Deckard to his daughter who is the most wanted person in the history of want people? This will definitely endanger her given that Leto's character has a relationship with her and probably has her under some sort of surveillance.

Hero comes back from the dead to say the day cliche; at end was extremely predictable and had me rolling my eyes, which I shouldn't be

doing the first time I watch a film.

The blackout sounds like a much more interesting story than this.

Caused by replicants? A solar flare? Was there a Trump two term presidency in this universe?

Robots reproducing and creating their own has already been cover in

Battlestar Galactica, who did it in a more compelling fashion with characters and stakes I cared about

Plus, how come Leto's character hasn't figured out on to get replicants

to reproduce? Why can't he produce them faster? How many has he killed before delivering a monologue

Some of the visuals are stunning though lack depth or colour. The

future looks fairly boring in comparison to Bladerunner 1982, which offered some very unusual street shots and characters. One included a guy with a eagle on his head. Nothing to really catch the eye in

BR2049.

Why not have Rachel as leader of the rebellion instead of some random

person the audience has no connection with.

When the capture Deckard, why on earth wouldn't they kill K?

How did K know how to find the car with Dekkard at the end? We don't

see him doing any investigative work to discover this information, despite the long run time.

They made a replicant clone of Rachel but get the eye colour wrong?

Seriously?

How heavy handed was the prejudice? No subtlety whatsoever. Jeepers,

you spend all that money on effects but then go minimum wage on screen writers.

That sex scene reminded me of Ghost with all the syncing going on. Watching Whoopi do her thing was just as sexy as watching this scene,

despite it having two incredibly attractive women present, along with Ryan Gosling who is no slouch himself in the looks department.

The replicant rebellion feels shoehorned in rather than something which has grown and developed organically. Need to take lessons from Star

Wars on how to introduce a rebel alliance story.

The golden rule of cinema is broken here when they show/play clips from

a much better film.

Critics are only offering gushing praise for a film with considerable

flaws because they don't wish to get caught out like the critics of 82.

Back then, the critics hated it because they couldn't see the hidden depth, this time they see depth that simply isn't there. Even one of the character says something along these lines to another.

1

BR2049 has more plot holes than emmental cheese and one big "plot twist" that I won't mention, not because it would spoil much, but because if you decide to watch this movie, you deserve to be disappointed by its stupidity.

The big "twist" is mentioned as the "miracle", but it is absolutely idiotic and illogical from the point of view of a manufacturer of

replicants. How did that might have ever be considered a good idea? One would assume that after the disaster of the Nexus 6 series, Tyrell Co. and his successors would have invented some more reliable security system - such as a lower level of self-consciousness, way safer than the questionable obedience of the Nexus 8. Or even something like all the androids looking the same, so that they can be easily detected and you would not need blade runners to locate and eliminate them. Anything that would provide humanity with useful, free labor without ethical problems; But no, in this movie ethical problems just got exponentially bigger. And so much for a science so advanced as to reproduce perfect bodies and minds... Besides, since it is established that humankind sucks, I failed to understand how replicants are in any way better, since they just want to be more like humans; . On the visual side, BR2049 sucks, too. Looks like they used random leftovers scenery from other Sc-Fi/disaster movies, from the overused industrial background of Terminator to the desertic blurred landscape of MadMax and the inevitable nightmarish city-scape, which looks like Blade Runner, but on cheap side. Costumes looks like the contemporary drab clothing promoted by Nordic high street chains: lots of dark, cheap-looking leggings and stretchy tops, a far cry from the decadent, elaborate futuristic/retro suits of BR. In one scene, Deckard meets Tyrell's successor in a closed room filled with water, except a square island in the middle. A room that has no other reason to exist except bringing back memories of the original Tyrell building. The dialog is unbelievable bad and scenes drag on forever. When the Goslin character finds Deckard, the two spend over ten minutes fighting and chasing each other, when a couple of lines of dialogue would have avoided that. The ending is both manipulative and plagiarist: it wants to move the audience, recreating the amazing poetic moment of Roy Batty's death, but using snow instead of rain. If nothing else, the ending would have been enough to put me off this piece of commercial garbage.

8

I've only seen the original Blade Runner once and it was a long time ago. I liked it but I just haven't got around to revisiting it. I mention this because even though I'm not a die-hard fan of Blade Runner, I still found the plot of 2049 engrossing. It's a well put together mystery, I found that they constantly took the plot in unexpected directions and other than the trailer spoiling the return of Deckard, I was always excited about what was going to happen next. The movie pulls an excellent bait and switch at the end that really surprised me. They made the right decision to not repeat the formula of the first one and take the story to a new place. They also create some compelling subplots which is something that few movies get right. The biggest

star of this movie is the cinematography and the excellent work of Roger Deakins. The original was noteworthy with the special environment that Ridley Scott and his creative team brought to the screen. That was continued here if not improved upon. The look of L.A. in 2049 they decided to go with isn't completely distinct but it was a little more understated (I'd compare it to the 2017 Ghost in the Shell but less fantastical). My favourite scene might have been a shootout in a defunct club where the lighting and the background show are turning on and off. I don't hesitate to praise when a movie looks good but this is an exemplary example of using visuals and atmosphere to help build on a strong story.

Blade Runner 2049 returns very few of the characters from the original film but they manage to breathe life into this movie through the new ones they created. Officer K isn't the most lively protagonist but he gets an eye-opening character arc that kept me involved. Deckard doesn't appear till later in the movie but he remains interesting and what they decide to do with him makes his appearance worthwhile. I also really liked some of the smaller supporting characters. Sapper really helps kick off the movie, what Joi represents is extremely emotional and Mariette is so mysterious that her involvement brings up more and more questions. Add in that Niander Wallace and Luv make for pretty menacing villains and you have a pretty well-rounded and fascinating script.

I don't think that the actors/actresses will be the focal point of the awards attention that this movie will get but that doesn't mean there aren't exemplary performances. Gosling is good as K, he's deliberately robotic and he accomplishes a lot through his subtlety. Harrison Ford isn't in the movie as much as I wanted him to be (he's still one of my all-time favourite actors) but he holds up his end. He works with Gosling well and they have a solid rapport. Surprisingly, I really liked Sylvia Hoeks. She stole a lot of her scenes and I thought she was great even acting against a stacked cast. Dave Bautista showed he has a lot more range than people give him credit for. Jared Leto is in a very Jared Leto role (deliberately weird and hard to understand) but he does it well and although he might be a little creepy, the guy is still a great actor. I also want to credit Ana de Armas, she was distinctly warm and she showed a lot more emotion than I had seen from her previously.

There were points in this movie I could have rated this a 9/10 but some small things that I had to dock the movie for. Even with a compelling story, the movie has such a long run time that it couldn't help but drag. There are certain scenes where the movie wants you to really drink in the environment but they could have edited it a little tighter. They also couldn't help but lose me at points through how much artistic flair they utilize. Villeneuve is an authority in this area and while I appreciate an artistic approach to this science fiction tale, for me they overdid it a little.

I was surprised how much I ended up liking Blade Runner 2049. I think

if you're a big fan of the original, you'll love this to bits. This is successful in bringing in the uninitiated but I think fans will enjoy this even more. I haven't been on board for all of Villeneuve's films but this is a good combination of his artistic style with enough of a commercial element for the masses. I'd give this somewhere between an 8-9 but with the extremely long run time, I'll give this an 8/10.

8

So, I didn't expect much from this sequel when it was announced, but since the original Blade Runner is, in my opinion, one of the greatest movies ever made (if not the greatest), I had to see it anyways. As I often do, I didn't read any reviews or watch any trailers before going.

So, where do we start... While not perfect, and inferior to the original, this is still a great movie. Visually it's simply stunning and the actors are all excellent. Just as importantly, or maybe even more so, like the original it combines a slow pace and fantastic ambiance to create an introspective mood and invite reflection on some important themes and issues of our time. (although, maybe, lacking a dialogue with the same power as the Roy Batty monologue at the end of the first movie).

As some negative reviewers said, it is slow..... but that works well

with the story and its intent to create a very clear, pervasive mood rather than to dazzle with dumb car chases, gunfights, or explosions, not to mention pushing the viewer to form his own opinions. The boring part is subjective: for viewers who like to be challenged intellectually I'd say many action movies are a lot more boring. Nothing wrong with escapist movies, which I also enjoy when I'm in the right mood, but it doesn't change the fact that they're inherently much more predictable, superficial and formulaic. In other words, entertaining but intellectually boring.

Regarding Blade Runner 2049, one disappointment, though, to be honest, was the soundtrack: aside from being too loud, it really consists mostly of weird sounds/noises etc. While they do heighten the mood at times, or fit the atmosphere, they are not really not up to the lofty standards of the photography, the action, or the direction.

Also, the plot could have been a little tighter, and while the slow pace is what this movie needed, I'm not convinced it really had to be this long (or to touch on so many themes, as it does).

Still, it's a fantastic, and unique, viewing experience, and even with its imperfections it does create a believable (if gloomy and depressing) dystopian vision of the future, and touches on themes that could spark endless debate and reflection. And herein lies its beauty: shallow popcorn movies will have faded from everybody's memory in weeks. A movie like Blade Runner 2049 will inspire us and challenge us, whether we agree with some of its vision or not, maybe even whether we love it or hate it, for years to come.

1

I always gave the original Blade Runner 10/10. Seen it a over a 1000 times including at the movie theater. Good pace, visuals, music, likable characters, bad guys. Yup, pretty much everything. One of my top 10 movies of all time. This review for 2049 is not because it should be the same thing or make it over the top.

OK now this Blade Runner 2049. Bad boring. Where nothing really means much. Unlikable characters, music is "meh" nothing unique(A poor version of the original_. Bad people in this, who cares? Bring us back with someone who is actually a threat(like Roy). We have some stupid terminator woman who really just flat out sucks. Poor casting. Jared Leto sucks. Yeah, he really does. Then you have the black guy with a cane from walking dead, who talks to everyone sideways. Who talks to people sideways? Why did you cast him? I've never see someone in any other movie, show or real life talk to people when they are not looking at them. Fail!!! I thought it was stupid in walking dead and now its really stupid. Plot is blah. Oh, it's also like a journey for Ryan Gosling to go from one Cameo to another with another boring scene. Not much vocab, emotion. Even Roy in the original had TONS of emotion and even had poetry at the end when he decided to turn a corner and save life instead of destroying everything in his path.

Harrison Ford is just an old man in this(sorry to say). Think it's time to retire. Did nothing in this film except hold a gun in Ryan's face and get captured with handcuffs.

Do not believe the hype, not a good movie.

6

What a disappointment, so much hype and, therefore, expectation but this is no more than a competent sci-fi film, certainly not a worthy successor to the original. I could support a 163 minute run time if there was plenty of content but at times it felt like the actors were moving and speaking slowly not for effect, but to fill in the gaps. As for the plot, everything revolved around the ability or otherwise of replicants to breed. If you have the technology to grow a human body from scratch and implant whatever memories you want I'd have thought introducing the mechanics of reproduction wouldn't be difficult. I could go on but really, this film isn't worth the bother.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

1

i cannot believe these ten star comments, first the visuals were mostly flat, there was no explanation why in this time there were virtually no people around, one scene only with about thirty extras, no lights seems to be on either in the shots were he is flying over the city. more importantly you had a very thin plot that could have been told in less than an hour. nothing happens for most of the film. it is as if all

concerned were on valium. the music was just noise. talk about an anti-climatic ending, the film just whimpers out. none of the very little plot made any sense. so here we have yet again critics raving about nothing. an insult to the original in every way. do not waste your time or money going to see this. i was going to list the many non-sensical things in the film but on reflection i don't think the film deserves anymore of my time

9

Similar responses to the original Bladerunner when it came out in 1982 (when feel-good hit ET was in theaters) and how people didn't know what to make of the then bleak, slow-paced Sci-Fi film. This is not unlike introducing Guardians of the Galaxy fans to 2049 today, an even darker, longer journey into the same Sci-Fi world. I can understand why some people might not like it, mostly due to attention spans and needing more explosions and violence with hyper-editing and a groovy soundtrack. This is not a knock on those movies, this is just a different genre. And just like the original, not everybody gets it or truly appreciates what has been accomplished here. This is a BIG movie, with a mystery that leaves you thinking and knowing that no matter what your first opinion is, a second viewing is required to even begin grasping everything you just saw. And not everybody wants to do that because they don't want to be challenged. They want the eye-candy action, a foot-tapping soundtrack and a vegetable soup ending spelled out for them (in 2 hours or less). So no, this movie is not for them.

However, if you're a fan of the original Bladerunner and that particular dystopian world, this movie takes it to another level. After seeing the original film, I remember wondering what the world outside of the dark LA nights in 2019 would be like? And that is just one of the ways 2049 has expanded that notion, leaving an open door to an even bigger world with deeper questions beyond it. Yes it is a long and relatively slow paced movie (by design), and so was 'Once Upon a Time in the West'. And yet just like that movie as well as the original Bladerunner, over time, this too will get more and more appreciation with age (and wisdom) for those who truly appreciate the art of film-making. It's not perfect, no movie ever will ever to everybody will it? But it is an amazing achievement and I look forward to my next viewing with different eyes, taking in what I may have missed because there is so much to see and overlook.

3

Blade Runner is one of my favorite films of all time for a number of reasons:

1) Amazing groundbreaking trailblazing visuals that spawned an entire genre (aka 'cyberpunk').

2) Superb music by Vangelis that is integral to the film.

3) Great characters and amazing acting.

4)

Underlying philosophical themes of corporate oppression (Blade Runner is just a small cog in a huge machine just carrying on with his life doing the job because otherwise he's reduced to nothing), existentialism (what it means to be human) coupled with Biblical references presented in a subtle way.

5) Amazing practical special effects that make the world around the characters feel lived-in.

6) Meticulous attention to detail, lighting in particular.

While "2049" is nothing more than a mere attempt at recreating something in the style of the original by a studio committee ticking off the items in the checklist. The result is abysmal because it does not introduce something new in terms of visual design, interesting characters, music or story. On the contrary it tries so hard to tie itself to the original it's sickening. Call it fan-service or pandering, either way it leads to the movie being a highly derivative product that exists solely because of the original.

1) Plot lines that go against the premise of the original (Nexus 6 being able to reproduce, new Nexus 8 being easily distinguishable from humans) are stupid.

2) Acting is horrendous. Ana "Pouty lips" De Armas couldn't hold a candle to Sean Young not to mention the pretentious for pretentiousness sake Jared Leto. Ford is here for a paycheck and Gosling is deliberately one-note.

3) The music is a lame attempt at copying Vangelis's beautiful score.

4) Too varying visuals leave you with this feeling of an inconsistent world that doesn't follow the idea of polluted lifeless post-industrial world where the sun doesn't shine, it's constantly raining and the only light outside the building is that of the advertising that seems more real than anything else.

5) Running time. The original was purposefully slow while the overblown running time of the sequel comes off as director loving certain sets and trying to savor them far longer than he should've.

6) A myriad of logical mistakes and plot holes (kids with a 100% matching DNA are of different gender).

7) The opening shot with the closeup of an eye is almost beat for beat with the original.

8) The zooming sequence is hammered home by the sheer repetition.

9) The characters are bland, unoriginal and politically correct female copies of the originals, namely Madam and Luv.

10) The opening sequence is the unused part of the Fancher's script (watch Dangerous Days documentary).

Overall it seems that producers/writers have an erroneous idea of made the original film great. As if stuffing Biblical references into Neon-lit set pieces, inhabited by some pale copies of original characters and extending the awkward silences would amount to a great movie.

To sum up "Blade Runner 2049" does not reinvent the wheel, does not offer anything one-of-a-kind or even slightly memorable. There is no reason (other than cash flow for the studio execs) for it to exist.

Save the cash and rewatch the original that actually challenges your intelligence and leaves you with a lot to think about.

4

There's a lot to like about this movie. Ryan Gosling gives a fantastic performance, both nuanced and surprisingly emotional. The action, when there is action, is well filmed and brutal and fun to watch. The CGI is pretty much flawless, and I'm not joking when I say that while watching this movie, you'll think you're watching a real world. The film is interesting, it's well shot, well directed, it's visually stunning, it's pretty, and the score is very thrilling. But as a whole, this movie is just so god da*n boring.

Look, I like slow paced movies, but this film is beyond slow paced. It's brain dead. It's literally like watching a person with no arms and legs try to crawl across a football field. I won't lie, at first I liked this slow pace because it built up a lot of tension, a lot of mystery, a lot of suspense, and I assumed that eventually the film would kick into high gear; it never did. The pace remains constant throughout the entire run time of this movie. It's excruciatingly slow. The movie is almost 3 hours long, and it feels like 6. I couldn't wait for this movie to end, I mean by the end of the movie I expected to look in the mirror and see that I aged 65 years.

And also, the film is also overly convoluted. I'm not saying that this is a confusing film, because it's not; in fact, it's pretty straightforward and easy to follow. It just simply felt like this movie was convoluted for the sake of it being convoluted. At the time of watching everything felt important. I had to pee so badly the entire movie but I didn't want to get up because I felt like everything I was watching was super important. However, only after viewing do I realize that there were so many scenes that were totally unnecessary, that were there only to make the movie longer, more bloated, and more self-important.

Unfortunately, there's just not much else to say. This is a simple movie, and it gets a simple review. Look, I wanted to give this a high score, but I just couldn't, and I don't understand why other people are because this movie is simply not enjoyable or entertaining. Yes, it's well made, a feast for the eyes and ears, but that doesn't make it a good film; it makes it a well directed and produced film, but not a good one.

3

Let me describe the sequence of Blade Runner 2049 for you

Here goes:

Enter the cinema with an overpriced orange juice that is mandatory because in the last couple of years Hollywood has decided it is artsy and de rigueur to make films longer than 2 hours. The lights dim and commercials kick in for 10 minutes. A game for pre-teens wasting

daddy's money on mobile phones and plans kicks in. 2 minutes of endorsements for GM trucks (with some guy whose tone is so macho I roll my eyes) follows. Then there is a reminder to get the right debit card to be hip and in. Then the film follows for a whopping 3 hours almost.

You would think that there was a lot happening and we were kept excited. Alas, the only thing that kept me awake was the very periodical appearance of a beautiful eye candy whether real, hologram or laser show version that would keep things exciting.

If it were not for the sexy and lovable women Blade Runner 2049 was inane. Yes, inane. Apparently, not every film needs a sequel, a lesson Hollywood didn't learn from Hangover.

The script was so corny and the words so elementary one would be excused for thinking this is a practical joke. Head of police, yes head of police is told a big lie by a contractor, head of police believes it and all is good. No double checking, no verifying, no details asked no proof required. it is a matter of life and death for the order of the world and, of OK, let's keep rolling guys. The ending was also a joke. A vehicle is drowning and the hero is being drowned but in the last second kills the bad gal and swims back to the vehicle to mount a rescue (for the sequels that will follow). Replicants can have and make babies, but how? Oh well, watch the prequel Blade Runner Rogue Uno, which is coming out in 2020.

At that point all I wanted in life was to buy my own Joi and Luv and go back home.

1

In the ongoing tradition of Harrison Ford's Action heroes of the 1980's turning out to be really terrible dads, we have Blade Runner 2049, the sequel to 1982's Blade Runner.

We meet a replicant cop named K who is of a new variety that doesn't rebel unlike those bad ones in the movies. So he tracks down a Runaway Nexus 8, even though in the original movie, we were assured that Nexus 8's only had 4 year lifespans. During the course of this, they discover the bones of Sean Young's character from the original movie, along with the realization she had given birth.

Our hero also has a relationship with a Hologram Girl for some reason. I guess so he is sad when she gets deleted later in the movie.

If you are watching this movie to see Harrison Ford reprise his role as Deckard, you don't get to see him walking around like someone's confused grandpa until 2 hours into an interminably long movie. (Seriously, I feel bad for Ford. Why does he do this to himself?)

So they want to find the child of Deckard and Rachel because this is a replicant that can reproduce, which is supposedly more efficient than just growing them, for some reason. They say they need more replicants to colonize the outer colonies, but of course, there are plenty of people living in squalor, including a child labor sweatshop.

I can't emphasize enough how long, boring, uninteresting this movie

was. It's like they watched the original and still had no idea what made it a good movie.

1

I didn't realise 2049 also was the actual length of the film! It sure felt like it! 3 hours of boring dialogue, hollow characters and an embarrassingly weak story. Hard to believe Ridley Scott really made this!

The first Blade Runner worked the pace of the film brilliantly up to the powerful ending. The story was a rather simple sci-fi noir detective story with a twist. It made some huge comments on humanity and what kind of future we want. It worked on so many levels. It could be viewed as a simple sci-fi detective story or as a great spiritual journey that asked all the big questions. "And what can your maker do for you?".

The first Blade Runner had so many great lines but with 2049 I cannot remember a single quotable line. 2049 completely lacks all which made the original the best sci-fi movie ever. I take the same view as Rutger Hauer recently did. Why even try to do a second one? It would be as painting a second Mona Lisa. Or building another Eiffel tower.

A huge disappointment of a sequel that should never have been made.

1

I have not seen such a badly made movie in a really long time. The only thing good about this movie is the actors. who did a good job in doing what they were told to. But the story is a pathetic layering of a typical family drama projected onto flying cars that is supposed to be our future. The jest of story, we industrialize ruthlessly to shred nature and then struggle to find a human emotion within ourselves and wage a war to hold on to it. Pathetic, heard many times, over and over. I am not sure if the theme was disguised as to give a facade of art or was so poorly directed that it was not even strongly projected. Either way, it gave me headaches. And the music was so grossly out of sync with the picture, it made no sense remotely. The unnecessary loud noises had not 1% context with what was happening on screen. Ridiculously long, out of context, poor direction, senseless sound effects, sorry picture of the story. sheer torture to sit through it.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

6

After seeing the the sequel to the amazing and amazing first Blade Runner, i am not disappointed. But i am not impressed either. In summary, 2049 plays it's cards too close to the chest, but without the element of surprise or good main characters to back it up. So lets break this movie down shall we?

Sound: 3/10 The sound is perfectly mixed.... and that's that. Otherwise

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

it's like the new Doom soundtrack, just a bunch of bass rumbling around on top of old Vangelis lines (but probably without the vintage hardware). A few of the tracks are Psybient/Solar Fields like, which really fit into the scenes. But overall, it's pretty uninspiring.

Visuals: 7/10 The sets are amazing, but there is definitely something off. The first movie had some sets that were really realistic, which is what I think made the movie believable. There was dirt, glass, patches of color, mats, live candles. It is the same as the visual difference between Alien/Aliens and Prometheus, if that makes any sense. It is obvious that they tried to replicate the set pieces of the original, but it comes off as way, way too grandiose and large-scale.

Pacing: 2/10 Horrible. Every scene is dragged out so long that you could walk out, cook some food and come back without missing a single important thing in the story. Sure, the first Blade Runner was slow, but it wasn't moving like a drugged sloth. To sum it up, they could have easily pushed the story into an hour long movie instead of three.

Story: 4/10 This is really where they dropped the ball. The characters are so boring they might as well be extras, especially Deckers girlfriend. I didn't care about her at the start, and I didn't care about her when she died. Also, the main villain. I mean, really? What were they thinking? She is so one-dimensional, she might as well be played by Brian Thompson. And no, making her cry while she kills things does not make her more complex and believable. The villain in the first Blade Runner, played by Rutger Hauer, at least had a glowing personality. Also, some scenes and ideas are just there for shock value. You will know which ones they are.

In summary: There is not one line or scene in the whole movie which is even close to the quality of the monologue at the end of the first movie.

5

As someone I know said, this is a "cargo cult movie". It has all the exterior of what a great Blade Runner sequel would look like but there is little underneath.

Visuals are stunning, music and sound are good, camera work is as it should be, but when you get down to its core, there's little there. I am not usually the one to complain about a slow pacing or a plot that requires some suspense of belief, but here it seems they serve as a way to achieve the deep and philosophical feel without actually being either. Acting overall is mediocre at best, actors fail to convincingly relay emotion of the characters, that are themselves written quite shallow, unrelatable and one dimensional. There are some interesting questions raised by the plot, the whole thing is far from a total disaster, but nothing is explored deep enough or clearly enough to be truly interesting or engaging. That's why this movie is going to be remembered just as a sequel to it's famous original.

1

This movie was so bad I can't put into words. I loved Blade Runner but this sequel is so bad I can no longer watch the original.

Music over the top Acting nonexistent Length, felt like 6 hours, and not in a good way

As people left the theater I saw shaking heads.

Don't understand people raving about it. They must be connected to the film somehow.

Save your money, watch the original and don't let this ruin it for you like it did for me

7

Being a hardcore Blade Runner and science fiction fanatic, I felt deeply compelled to write this review. I love Ridley Scott's original 1982 Sci-Fi classic. It is my all-time favorite movie. It had mystique and infused my imagination. It was a unique experience; hypnotic & surreal. The sequel, not so much!

My initial reaction of BR 2049 was that it's a gorgeous film. I was mesmerized by the striking cinematography and couldn't take my eyes off the screen. I will go as far saying that it's one of the most beautiful films I've ever seen. The rich visuals are so glaring it's hard to take it all in and grasp what you are seeing. From the opening shot you know you're in Blade Runner world. The overall look is instantly relatable to the first film and it's an amazing continuation in that regard. Also, the acting was excellent. The entire cast did a great job. However, once I settled into the film I realized that it is mainly a self-indulgent visual feast containing a weak story that lacks clarity & wisdom. There are obvious cliché moments and in certain aspects the story is comical and naive. The movie delves into complex philosophical themes and asks important questions but seldom explores them. It's all over the place. You get the sense that the film is not sure what it wants to be? It's clearly style over substance. Lots of homage is paid to the original through awesome images but the plot is paper-thin with a few subplots & twists added to make it seem intelligent. But is it? Well, not really! I think the movie tries too hard to be smart but fails to engage due to its long running time & fuzzy story/script, which may end up confusing and distancing the viewer.

BR 2049 has been most widely criticized for its length, and rightly so. It's overly long with some unnecessary scenes & dialogue whereas the first film was more subtle. BR1 was also slow-paced but in a different way. It had suspense and gradual progression to climax whereas BR2 is forced and even distracting at times. I love slow-paced films don't get me wrong! I can watch a film all day as long as it leads to a point and has tension. Certain films are deliberately made slow to establish a specific mood (e.g. Kubrick & Tarkovsky films). They draw you inside the film and make you feel like you're part of it. BR1 does this

perfectly while the sequel is stretched out for the wrong reasons. It comes across as an excuse to showcase impressive visuals which is great if it moves the story along but not for the fun of it. BR1 had long takes and brief dialogue but it drove the story along smoothly and its characters behaved realistically. There was a seamless flow to it. It's humorous how BR2 tried to mimic this technique from BR1 yet failed because its characters talk & move super slowly unlike real life.

Although it's a visually stunning film, I found it to be almost void of

emotions and musicality. The characters were uninteresting and lacked emotional depth. In other words, I didn't care about them. I was not sure about any of the characters' motivations. In the first film, all the characters shined with charismatic personalities. They were unique in their own way and I truly cared about them. They embodied everything that makes us human. This was a vital element that made the original so special. BR2 on the other hand has sad and forgettable characters. It is a very sad film whereas the original had moments of happiness to mix up feelings and lighten the mood, which made it more realistic.

The music in BR 2049 was the biggest let down for me. It just didn't make sense because there was no music. A strange mix of very loud noises with faint echoes of original Vangelis tones interlaced (I listened to the entire score to be sure!). The musical score by Vangelis in the first film was one of the key elements that made the original my favorite film of all-time. I love atmospheric films that are visually & musically driven to tell the story. The music creates different feelings that make you fantasize. It makes you feel the movie and think about it long after it's over. The music in BR1 was incredible. It set the tone of the film perfectly. There was a haunting eerie atmosphere that along with the images created a hypnotic feel. Vangelis mostly used an electronic sound but he also incorporated piano & saxophone for melancholic effect. Not so in BR2. They messed up enormously this time. I know it's not possible to recreate Vangelis but they could have at least tried to create similarly-styled music by using the original score as a foundation. Even better, they could have perhaps made a completely original soundtrack all together. Blade Runner is an atmospheric film that is about feel and therefore must have a perfect music to visual ratio. Sure, they brought back one Vangelis theme for nostalgia but it wasn't enough.

To conclude, I enjoyed the film but unfortunately cannot say I loved it. I simply cannot fathom the enormous praise given by critics & moviegoers. I don't think they understood what made the first film brilliant. BR 2049 does contain the main elements required for a true Sci-Fi film but fell flat at further exploring its themes. The original film on the other hand is a masterpiece. It felt spiritual & spellbinding whilst the sequel did not. Should you go see it? Yes. I would still recommend fans and anyone curious to go see this film in theaters despite its evident flaws. But as a huge fan it left me disappointed. Maybe I had high expectations!

I gave it a generous 7/10

3

All the problems with the original theatrical version of Blade Runner, which Scott Ridley fought against are here. Ridley has become the studio system.

Blade Runner 2049, likely the least desired sequel in history, is making Philip K Dick roll in his grave. What is the point of this almost three hour-long sequel? Of course, it is to continue the film industry's addiction to sequels and make cash. That is it.

Let me get this straight: the world is devastated and anyone who is anybody moves off-world, but people are living in spacious luxury in a casino drinking fine aged Scotch? There is beautiful white snow falling from the skies and sexy call girls approach you on the street? This world is for schmucks, but the main character has an artificial girlfriend with legs to die for waiting at home for him making dinner and giving him threesome sex? Someone book me a ticket back from off-world to Earth please!

This was the kind of logical misstep that Ridley fought against when the studio released BR to cinemas with a gorgeous drive through the countryside at the end of the original. It makes no sense.

Face it, this is the film that should not exist and by watching all these franchise films we feed the stupidity of Hollywood.

BR2049 is the same as the last 10 marvel films, the next ten Star Wars films and the Ghostbusters sequel, but is prettier and more visual.

3

Blade Runner 2049 comes off incredibly long and boring. Not because of the slow pacing & Blade Runner had slow pacing too, but had the viewer hypnotized; but because there's no interesting thoughts present and nothing new really. Thematically the movie is exploring the same questions (about being human etc.) as the first movie did 35 years ago. And the few new additions to the Blade Runner universe are totally devoid of originality. Take for instance K's hologram-wife. Not only are those scenes totally unnecessary (that three-way scene, jeez!), but we've seen the concept so many times before (for instance in Spike Jonze's Her).

Apart from that, the movie is riddled with plot holes and stuff that just doesn't make very much sense. Tyrell gets killed off by a replicant and his Nexus-7 prototype runs off, shortly after Tyrell Corp rushes a line of replicants with OPEN ENDED lifespans and no other safety device than implanted memories (that didn't work with Rachael). No. Just no.

Furthermore we are told the nexus 9 are programmed to obey. However K lies to his superiors, constantly acts on his own, acts emotionally from early on in the movie. He does not obey at all.

And the revelation of a replicant child being born has people talking about revolution. Robin Wright's Joshi says it will break the world;.

But how? Rachael was the only replicant able to give birth and Tyrell took that secret with him. Neither the few remaining Nexus 8's or the 9's can give birth; so no, it doesn't break the world. It doesn't break anything. But the movie really wants us to take this very seriously (Hans Zimmer is doing his loudest to make us sit in awe).

And it gets even worse. Later we learn that Jared Leto's ridiculous bad guy Wallace (those monologues!) strives to learn the secret of making replicant babies. But why? That undermines the entire idea of replicants. Tailormade slaves with superhuman ability; strength, intelligence etc. that are controlled by implanted memories. Having replicants make babies the old way would offer zero control of the outcome and the child replicants would have to grow up, go to school, make their own memories. What's the point then? And what's the difference, from just having some people make babies?

A lot of people has called 'Blade Runner 2049' 'intellectual sci-fi'; and so forth, but I found it to be quite the contrary. The movie forcefully demands you to accept it as highly intelligent art, but if you scratch the surface, you'll find something very different.

7

Beautiful and empty Bladerunner 2049 is the needless sequel to the 1980s classic.

Set 30+ years after the events of the first film we meet Ryan Gosling continuing in the Bladerunner tradition of shooting robots. Along the way, he discovers a great secret that might change the social order of a world that is made up of humans and they're purpose built slaves.

All of that was covered in the first 20 minutes of the film by the way. Skip ahead to the 3rd act, grumpy Harrison Ford shows up and, well, that's about it.

Leaving the theatre my wife and I tried to decide just why Bladerunner left us both feeling so indifferent to it's existence. She had never seen the first film, I had, but our feelings were the same. Bladerunner is great to look at and I appreciated the nods to the original, but, it became quickly apparent our apathy stemmed from the fact nothing much happens in this movie.

Office K's (Gosling) investigation into a missing person moves at snails pace and none of the people we meet along the way are as interesting as the scenery around them. One example is Wallace (Jared Leto) the new Tyrell and the main villain of the film. His speeches are dull and only go to serve the plot, he leaves all of his serious evilness to his sidekick while he stays home sporting a handicap which must be a desired physical affectation considering how easily it could be treated in his time.

The main theme in both Bladerunner movies is one day the slaves will cast off their chains and be free. Sure, there's stuff about love and self-awareness but these are side issues that have been explored

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

elsewhere to better effect. The main focus of 2049 is humanity needs an indentured underclass to do its heavy lifting and either you are for it or against it and that is a pretty thin premise for a movie this long.

Late in the film Officer K sits on a deck chair staring out over an irradiated city. He looks like a man lost, not knowing where to go next. This moment is the perfect metaphor for Bladerunner 2049. All of it's surprises are revealed too early on leaving both the audience and characters to mull over the same obvious of choices for the rest of the movie.

A wasted opportunity.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
8

I love the book so I was really excited to see this, and I have to say I was not disappointed. The acting was brilliant and the film very well made. Aside from a few changes it mostly follows the book quite closely which I was pleased about and the end was especially well done. I have to confess that I haven't actually got round to seeing any of the other adaptations of the book yet but I certainly enjoyed this one.

9

I haven't seen the 1974 version so this movie easily stands out in all aspects to me, whether it was the camera view or the cast ensemble. While reviewing, people often forget the issue with the original story i.e. it's set entirely in the train. Considering the limited space that they had, Branagh does an amazing job with the direction. This isn't just a remake but in fact an entirely different adaptation. Not that it runs away from the main story but it has a sort of different take on it. Apart from that, Branagh easily manages to portray Poirot with all his eccentricity. (The accent was the pull factor for me). Josh Gad does an amazing job with Hector McQueen. Judi Dench shines as Princess Dragomiroff along with Pfeiffer as Mrs. Hubbard. The only bummer was the fact that it leaves you wanting for more.

8

I was a bit skeptical about this movie, but I must say I was pleasantly surprised. Of course, it's not perfect, and sometimes Branagh overdo it a little, but whoever likes the genre will be captured by the fantastic atmosphere and will not be bored, because Branagh has been able to put some pepper on the story. His Poirot convinced me and the old glories like Judy Dench, Willelm Defoe and Johnny Depp do their job and do it well, but in my opinion the most interesting notes come from the young people: I personally loved Josh Gad and Daisy Ridley, but the real surprise was Sergei Polunin: I mean, for those who saw him performing as dancer, it's not a real surprise, but it's really hard to believe it

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

was his first time in a movie! He has given to his character this melancholy, turbulent and passionate aura, halfway between a Shakespearean prince and James Dean. His expressions, his little gestures, the way he looked at his wife, he made me feel like a teenager who cannot wait to buy his poster and stick it over her bed! And let me say, that guy definitely knows how to "handle" a woman as well as he can deliver a kick! As usual, more the critics hate a film, more it worth to be seen.

7

I went to see Murder on the Orient Express last night and this is my review. I am rating it 7/10

A quick overview of the film is that someone is murdered on the Orient and the worlds best detective played brilliantly by Kenneth Branagh must solve this case with caution and intelligence.

The film starts smoothly with some laughs produced by Kenneth. We meet every character before the train journey and that's when the guessing begins.

I really enjoy a film that keeps you guessing and gives you a few unexpected twists. The orient certainly delivers that.

Pros: Few well timed laughs, Kenneth Branagh is fantastic, Guessing Twists, Being focused on what is going on Lovely scenery, Great cast and an intense story.

Cons: To be honest, with the type of film it is and plot. There isn't anything bad I can say about it because it delivered Agatha Christie's story very well.

An entertaining watch for those who like a mystery film with a strong cast and to be engaged throughout but getting you to guess at most stages of the film.

I guessed loads but was wrong!

Thank you and hope you enjoy this review

10

We always do the same mistake when a movie is made following a best selling novel is that we compare the novel and the movie. But we must keep in mind that novel is always superior than movies in many aspect. So my earnest request to the audience please don't compare it with the novel. When you compare you will loose the momentum of the movie. Because it is an excellent movie...A pure crime thriller of pre modern era. It has suspense as well as buried past mystery of all the passenger's life. This made the detective process more complicated.

The movie has many aspects to cheer about. It has a good portrait of some 18 th century look with all those etiquettes and manners. The movie is fully loaded with the part part story of different suspects that made it difficult for the audience to guess the final answer.

As you know most central roles were done by excellent actors and actresses there is no complaint about the acting. All the acting was very much splendid. Only it can be said that they have done it a little

heavy. The dialogues are sometimes a bit too much for the audiences to capture.

Over all the movie is a little slow..Like the thriller movies of early

1960's or 70's . But it has many good things to offer. A group of excellent actors together with a fine plot and diffuse suspense has made it a good enjoyable movie. But as i said it is a bit slow and dialogue dependent movie some viewers may experience it as a boring time. i have to say you had better show some patience and you will find the gold. This is A movie that can shake you when you will watch it even for the second time..Imagine what will happen when you go for the first time?????

10

Kenneth Branagh does it again. For many years the sniffy set of Guardian-types would turn up their Metropolitan noses at Agatha Christie. Her writing was, evidently, not high-brow, she churned out too many and (horror of horrors) she wrote airport thrillers.

But Christie understood human nature in its myriad forms and she wrote accordingly: at times with brilliance.

It is this which Kenneth Branagh so fabulously unveils in his Murder on the Orient Express. Yes, he has assembled a world class cast of superstar actors, but it's Branagh himself, both as actor and Director, who pulls the real meaning of this story out.

This is a tale of loss, sorry, unrequited grief and, above all, revenge. You don't get much more powerful emotions in human existence and these are wonderfully executed here.

It's fantastic, even if you know the plot. Go and see it and watch this wonderful tale again from a different perspective. Don't go just for light-hearted entertainment. It is that on one level. But it's also a tale which plumbs the depths of human existence: what Poirot calls 'the poison of deep grief.'

Fabulous film.

4

My wife and I looked so forward to seeing this movie. Unfortunately it was boring. No drama, no suspense. The cinematography was excellent. we actually saw people leave the cinema before the end of the movie. The star studded cast really don't shine. Very much a Sunday evening TV viewing movie.

8

Fill a train with a most impressive cast line up, throw in a grisly murder mystery and have the mighty impressive Kenneth Branagh go on a quest to find out who done it and you got yourself a delightful little movie which will most certainly entertrain.

A take on Agatha Christie's popular novel Murder on the Orient Express,

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

the story follows that of detective Hercule Poirot, who is called on business to London, and so takes the last available room on the Orient Express. Though wanting nothing more than to relax and enjoy his journey, he inadvertently finds himself working, when one of the passengers is mysteriously killed.

It's a wonderful simple story which sees detective Poirot go from guest to guest questioning them on their whereabouts on that fateful night. The opening scene did worry me somewhat with it's overly smart-arsed series of events, akin to that of a last few SHERLOCK TV episodes. It risked going off the rails and being too clever, well beyond believable, but thankfully for the main mystery it calms itself down.

The 1h 54min runtime steams by as I sat and enjoyed first class performances from all the cast. Stand out characters were Daisy Ridley's Miss Mary Debenham, Josh Gad's Hector MacQueen, Leslie Odom Jr.'s Dr. Arbuthnot and of course the brilliant Kenneth Branagh as the brilliantly quirky and intelligent Hercule Poirot. Only Michelle Pfeiffer's performance lacked somewhat and took away from what could have been a much more emotional scene towards the end.

For a story that takes place almost entirely on a train, the director uses the limited space well, for as this narrative unfolds, it doesn't feel too claustrophobic, even in the narrow hallways and the tight compact cabins. Shifting the camera into creative perspectives at times helps keep the scenes fresh and visually stimulating (I especially enjoyed the birds eye view of the murder scene). The pacing is snappy and energetic and at no point feels like its running out of steam. Kenneth Branagh should also be commended for the way he juggles a story consisting of such a myriad of actors, by giving each character their own perspectives and motives, helps to keep the viewer on their toes; questioning every nuance and detail and while some are barely given any screen time, most feel substantially explored.

Overall Murder on the Orient Express conducts itself well, an interesting 'who done it?' mystery that will keep you guessing throughout. Wonderfully paced and fantastically performed. After something a bit different from your usual sci-fi/superhero adventure then this is just the ticket!

You can find more reviews like this over on my website:
www.popcornography.co.uk

1

DO NOT waste your money on this film. The script is bland, the CGI terrible, the acting bland and the directing a tour de force of Brannagh's egomania. Even his French accent was rubbish. I cannot believe how films like this ever get the money to get made. It was about as suspenseful as unleavened bread and deserves to simply be forgotten.

1

Worst film I have seen in my life 95% of it is just bullshit talking...

Few errors in the movie, waste of money.

I was expecting more out of it... than just pure talk.

Johnny Depp should of have played a better role than 15min...

Two other people that watched this film have left the cinema... that just shows how boring it can get.

6

There's some outstanding points in this film namely

1) Kenneth Branagh - his portrayal of the world's greatest Belgian detective is the best I've seen by far

2) Cinematography- exceptional alpine backdrops . Hand-held camera-work was exceptional

3) Casting - superb all star cast

But then there's the points that weren't so good

Some of script / delivery of lines was unintelligible

Some of the CGI was brilliant but some was quite poor and at one point the train looked like a child's toy! Also it felt a bit like the Polar express at times and that's over twelve years old!

Overall the film just could have been so much better it had all the ingredients , setting , cast , story but it failed to deliver a top notch performance. Shame really as I really looked forward to this and grudgingly paid the extra £4 for a reclining chair !

It sets itself up for DEATH ON THE NILE - I just hope that's a better rendition .

Pad.A 6.5/10

5

Good: The amazing all-star cast of academy award winners. Even though each actor/actress plays their role well, no one was a standout. The setting of most of the movie is the Orient Express, which helps contribute to a trapped and isolated feel and makes you feel as if you were there with the detective. The introductory to Hercule Poirot is great, but as the movie chugs along;

Bad: Overall, the movie lacks comedy and heartfelt moments. At times, the accent of Poirot is hard to understand, which leads to clues that are not clearly understood and a story that is hard to follow along. The movie is more of an interrogation of each character, by just going down the huge list of suspects and giving each character equal screen time. It progresses at a slow pace and the clues never lean me towards one person or another. I also did not find the murder to be inventive or creative.

Overall: Even with an outstanding cast, the movie suffers from a generic plot. The movie lacks the engaging aspects of a crime movie and relies too heavily on its cast to deliver its moments.

2.7/5

1

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

This is what happens when you give the Force Awakens raving reviews, you ruin cinema. Almost none of this endearing, the ensemble cast is not used well at all and perhaps not even considered much of a force save Brannagh. Johnny Depp is simply not good, Daisy Ridley is even worse. Terrible waste of time.

[illegible]

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
10

What a movie and what great acting. Frances McDormand has done amazing job and deserves awards for playing Mildred Hayes. Although a very serious subject, this movie is a comedy.

The punch lines are to the point and absolutely hilarious. I went to the Toronto International Film Festival to watch this movie and boy, do I consider myself lucky to have decided to watch it.

The story, screenplay, direction are amazing. After The Grand Budapest Hotel, this movie comes as a breath of fresh air.

9

Having recently won the People's Choice Awards at TIFF, Three Billboards outside Ebbing, Missouri is very easy to see why it won.

Three Billboards is a dark but also funny and heart-felt story about one woman's quest to get justice for her daughter's rape and murder. After Mildred Haynes buys three billboards with words written on them accusing the town's well-liked sheriff of having not found her daughter's killer, it sets a series of events that turns the citizens and the cops against her.

The thing I can say about Three Billboards without going into spoilers is that it is wildly unpredictable. One moment you think things are going one direction as expected then it takes hard left turn that only adds to the dynamic between the characters. As the pressure within the town builds and anger is pointed towards Mildred, we see many of these characters evolve in order to deal with tragedy and grief and learn to find peace. And the movie goes through a roller-coaster of emotions. One moment you are laughing your butt off from the hilarious dialogue then you feel like someone just punched you in the gut. With every victory you think this story brings you feel like it was taken away

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

from because of the world's unfairness and injustice. In lesser hands the mixture of dark and comedic tones would not work, but director and writer Martin McDonagh knows how to balance them to perfection.

The performances here just through the roof. Frances McDormand delivers a performance that will for sure get her into the Lead Actress awards race at the Oscars. As Mildred, McDormand just cuts loose with her performance with every line of hate, cynicism and cursing towards everyone she feels doesn't truly understand the internal pain she is going through. But McDormand does now and then show a soft side to Mildred. It shows that Mildred is just person like everyone who has her own way of dealing with the tragedy of losing her own child. And Sam Rockwell also gives one of the best performances of his career as the flawed and very misguided cop Dixon. The character of Dixon is short-tempered, volatile, and not bright with some baggage of his own that the locals accuse him of. But Sam Rockwell brings his charm and sincerity to what could be a rather unlikable character. And in the latter half, you see Dixon go through a tremendous arc of learning to care about others rather than just being angry towards them. Other great performances that should be called out are Woody Harrelson, Peter Dinklage, John Hawk and Caleb Landry Jones.

Three Billboards outside Ebbing, Missouri is easily one of the best movies this year and is worth seeing once it comes out in wide releases.

9

I watched this movie during the 2017 Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF) after it had won the Grolsch People's Choice Award. I already had high hopes for this movie and it definitely did not disappoint! Concept of the movie seems pretty easy to understand: Mildred Hayes (played by Frances McDormand) is still grieving the loss of her murdered daughter and challenges the local sheriff's (Woody Harrelson) inability to find her killer. From watching the trailer I was a little unsure if this was going to be a drama or a comedy, but turns out it was both, or more accurately a dark comedy. The first few minutes of the movie really set the tone for keeping you interested in the dramatic core, maintaining the humour in events as they unfold. Not only are the characters perfectly cast individually (example my fav Sam Rockwell as Officer Jason Dixon), but the writing of the entire script makes it so easy to enjoy this entire movie.

Writer/Director Martin McDonagh deserves a high five for this accomplishment!

9

It seemed that the pregnant police detective Marge Gunderson from
Fargo
 would forever be the most memorable character of Frances McDormand's acting career. But now I'm not so sure. Mildred Hayes, the

heroine from *Three Billboards*, is a serious contender. This might well be her best performance ever.

The part of Mildred Hayes was written with McDormand in mind. Hayes is a divorced single mother, living with her son on the outskirts of a small, remote town. She had a daughter too, but the girl was raped and killed on a quiet mountain road not far from home. Frustrated by the lack of progress of the investigation, Hayes decides to rent three dilapidated billboards, publicly accusing the local police chief of incompetence. By doing so, she attracts the attention of the media, angers almost the entire town and causes a succession of increasingly violent actions.

Although the film is about grief, anger, revenge and violence, it is extremely funny. Above all because of Hayes's stubborn character and her ability to verbally humiliate people by her extremely sharp tongue. The monologue she delivers when a priest visits her house to tell her she has gone too far, is priceless.

Apart from McDormand's performance, the screenplay is another great feature of this film. The story is full of unexpected twists, gradually shifting the positions of the main characters towards each other. None of the characters are one-dimensional: they all reveal surprising parts of their personalities as the story moves forward.

And then there is the overall, almost Coen-esque atmosphere of a small town full of colourful characters. There is a racist cop, a friendly midget, a smart advertising guy and a pretty girl who is so dumb she doesn't know the difference between polo and polio.

It is hard to mention something negative about this film. *Three Billboards* is, from start to finish, a great movie. I can't imagine anyone not enjoying it.

10

I tried to write the summary of this movie for three days and still i have not found the correct words to connect them in order to make a sentence capable of expressing the quality of it. I have written the summary many times and i have erased in every occasion. So i decided to show some dots in the summary. That is the symbol of how excellent the movie is.

The plot : The plot is very much uncommon. it has so many facts that it offers you a guessing 2 hour while you goes through the movie. It provides enough backbone to the rest of the element of the movie. It creates a concrete base upon which the movie stands firmly.

The mystery : As the movie deals with a murder it contains enough mystery to shake the audiences. Scene after scene all this unpacked. But they have to wait till the end to solve the puzzles.

The resistance : The movie is about the resistance of a mother. It starts with the desperate mission of a mother to bring the killers of her daughter to light. Those billboards, the sudden attacks, burgaining against the local authority.. all these are the part of a resistant mother which is

also the part and parcel of the movie.

Acting :

Acting in my view is up to the mark. Frances McDormand is exquisite in her role as a mother seeking justice. Others have also come to the party.

Direction :

This is the characteristics of the movie I was most impressed with.

Although the plot and the acting is out of question but it is the director who has the sole credit to connect all this. He has slowly but cleverly unfolded all the sector available. He is good enough to make the movie what it looks like in the projector. He has turned the raw materials to a mature masterpiece.

Questions and answers :

last of all the main event is the answers of the question that were aroused during the first session of the movie. You have to wait to find the answers. This waiting makes it more attractive.

So clearly it is a movie of great quality..a bit older type..but you know old is gold..

9

Outstanding work by writer/director Martin McDonagh, in a return to form after the off-kilter "Seven Psychopaths." This film about the joint cul-de-sacs of loss and revenge. It is both horrifying and touching, and it is also very funny.

McDonagh, a first-rate playwright, knows how to structure scenes and write dialogue. To do him justice, first-rate actors are required. They must love the succulent stew of characters he cooks up, because he catches the very best.

I can't find enough superlatives for Frances McDormand and Sam Rockwell. They are, here as in everything they've ever been in, great. They are ably supported by Woody Harrelson, Caleb Landry Jones, Clarke Peters, Sandy Martin, Lucas Hedges, John Hawkes, Amanda Warren. The only weak link in this superb ensemble is Abbie Cornish, who is warm and smiley but is unfortunately out of her depth: a very odd piece of casting.

Cinematography, production design, costume, editing, music - they're all top of the range. But in the end it's down to McDormand and Rockwell, and the brilliant script.

8

I was almost afraid from watching the trailer that this would be one of those overwhelming movies because it involved dark and serious subject matter. I was pleasantly surprised that it was actually enjoyable because of the way it dealt with all the serious subjects. The script mixed just the right amount of comedic relief (no, it isn't a comedy though there are some laugh out loud moments) with a compelling story. Each and every actor's performance was spot on for their character which helped make it well worth seeing!

10

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is a dark comedy that has an a-list cast with names like Frances McDormand, Woody Harrelson, Sam Rockwell, John Hawkes, and Peter Dinklage. It centers around Mildred Hayes, a woman whose daughter was raped and killed, and who believes that the local police have not done enough about it. In reaction, she erects three billboards outside of her town that send a message to the sheriff about the state of the investigation. Writer/director Martin McDonagh (Seven Psychopaths, In Bruges) has outdone himself with this one. In my opinion, if this isn't one of the top Oscar contenders come awards season, then Hollywood has officially lost its mind.

Basically everything about this film works: from the acting, to the writing, to the direction. McDormand gives the performance of her career here, giving us humor through all the pain clearly shown on her face. Rockwell also gives his best performance here as a cop who isn't that bright and is more than a little racist.

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is probably the most unpredictable film of the year, and that's coming from a year that includes films like Baby Driver and Logan. There are scenes where you think that you know where the plot is going, but then midway through it completely flips the script.

For the entire run-time of this film, I was invested. It has the perfect run-time; it ends exactly when it needs to and there is not a scene that feels out of place.

It seems like one of the hardest things to do in film nowadays is to balance comedy and drama. However, this movie does it effortlessly. Each scene has just the right amount of comedy and drama, and sometimes, despite the fact that you're laughing, it's easy to forget that jokes are being made.

Also, the message that this film gives off resonates very powerfully with you after the film finishes. It makes you see the good side in humanity, despite our flaws. No character in this film is a cliché; one-dimensional shell of a person. Everybody has a reason for being there, which is more than some films recently have offered.

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is easily one of the best and most enjoyable films of 2017, and it will make you laugh, cry, and think all in one sitting. There are not any clear flaws with this film that I can find, but I am still searching.

I give Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri an A+.

10

It goes without saying that dark comedy is very difficult to accomplish. I would almost say it's harder to pull off than regular comedy because you need to be able to keep people invested in the dramatic aspect of the film, while still keeping them laughing

throughout the majority of the duration. Director Martin McDonagh has matured as a filmmaker over the years, starting off with In Bruges, which was pretty much a flat-out comedy, to Seven Psychopaths, which placed him a little further into the spotlight, but I must admit that Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is not only his best film to date, but also one of the best films I've received the pleasure of witnessing all year. From laughter to genuine tension and heart, this is a film that's pretty much perfect all around. Here is why I can recommend this film to everyone.

After the tragic death of her daughter, Mildred Hayes calls out the

local authorities on three billboards, publicly stating that they're not doing their jobs and not a single arrest has happened since the death of her daughter. While publicly displaying this is upsetting to some, she sees it as a point being made. Through some very cleverly written humor throughout the entire film, levity is brought to the table in times of sorrow, making this a very easy movie to watch. Although the story itself is quite depressing, this film is written in a way that will still find a way to make you smile.

From the very first few frames of this film, you can tell the tone will

be handled perfectly. Written and directed by Martin McDonagh with pure class, you can tell that he was very passionate when bringing this film to fruition. Every line of dialogue either progressed the story along, developed a character, made the audience laugh, or provided deep insight into the event of the murder itself. While not having the bearings of a conventional murder mystery, many viewers may not like the way this film concludes, but in the context of the movie as a whole and everything it's setting out to accomplish, it really does have a realistic and true finale.

It's arguable that some of the law enforcement officers play just as

significant a role as Mildred does throughout the film, being pretty much present every time a revelation occurs, but I gravitated the most towards Officer Dixon. I've always been a huge fan of Sam Rockwell, and his character here is one of the most essential to this story, set on being there from beginning to end, trying his absolute best to be of any help. While Woody Harrelson's portrayal of Chief Willoughby is by far the most important to the story at hand, it's the characters around him that drive him to his actions throughout the course of the movie. The characters are truly what make this film as likable as it is, and they're all wonderfully drawn.

Overall, when looking back on my experience watching Three Billboards

Outside Ebbing, Missouri, I find myself not being able to wait until its official theatrical release to watch it again. I found this film to be stellar in every sense of the word. From a noteworthy performance by Francis McDormand, devoted secondary performances, a screenplay that will have you consistently laughing, while also being emotionally involved with the serious storyline at hand, and pulling the audience in with its subtly composed score, everything about this film is worth praise. This was a huge surprise for me and I can't recommend you

checking it out enough. Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is a fantastic piece of modern cinema.

9

Seen at the Viennale 2017: writing reviews about several movies in the last year, I nearly have to pass on this one. Three Billboards is of such high quality that it is nearly impossible to comment on it. Only highly professional reviewers should dare to write something about such high quality script, directing and cast. Why not ten stars, then? We still have to see, whether this one will become a classic movie for the Top 200. Maybe, it will. For sure it earns such a high rating. Three Billboards touches soul and heart from 10 minutes after the beginning up to the end. Seldom I changed from laughing to sadness in such a high frequency. But the movies greatest strength is: it gives hope. Hope in the possibility that people can change from the worse to the better. People are changing in this movie. People can change in real life. We get remembered that this is possible. For sure, I will never forget the highly emotional moment, when Dixon risks his life by grabbing the burning crime file of Hayes and jumps through the fire wall. This movie deserves every single Oscar it will (hopefully) get.

9

I won't even try and sum up all my feelings about this movie because no matter what I'd write, it wouldn't do it justice.

What I'll say is that it's brilliant, it's dark, it's hilarious - and not in a slapstick-funny-kind of way but in an authentic and real funny kind of way - and it transitions so effortlessly between that hilarity and despair that I was captivated throughout the entire film.

McDormand shines. Rockwell shines. Harrelson shines.

Everyone shines.

So far, for me, this has best screenplay, best actress in a leading roll and maybe even best actor in a supporting roll written all over it.

Every film lover is gonna talk about this gem in a couple of weeks/months and I'm sure that every film lover is gonna absolutely love this film.

Thank you, Martin McDonagh!

(9.1/10)

7

In the words of poet Harivansh Rai Bachchan, the beauty of film is "You get poetic justice in less than 3 hours. You often don't get poetic justice in a lifetime." If that'd be the case than the collective works of Martin McDonagh serves as a counterweight to such thinking. His films, often involve looking in vain for the nebulous concepts of love, justice and meaning in a post-modern world. His characters, likable if deeply flawed, shout into the void but never find the answers they seek.

Thus it's hard to truly gage a film like Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri. Much like In Bruges (2008) and Seven Psychopaths

(2012), this film is rich with wit yet syncopated in its own world of messy loops, twists, turns and tones. The story begins with the melodies of Renee Fleming's "Tis the Last Rose of Summer" but then ends

the first five minutes on the screen in capital letters. The letters spell out "RAPED WHILE DYING," "STILL NO ARRESTS?" "HOW COME, CHIEF

WILLOUGHBY". So starts the saga of the Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri, sanctioned by a grieving mother; printed for a dying man. The mother in this case is Mildred Hayes (McDormand), who much like her billboards stands unwavering. She's hassled by everyone from Sheriff Willoughby's (Harrelson) clueless deputies to her ex-husband Charlie (Hawkes). Still, even when her son Robbie (Hedges) is incensed to give her the silent treatment, Mildred demands her message be heard. Her teenage daughter was raped and murdered seven long months ago and nothing has been done. She wants justice. Yet the funny thing about justice in this movie is the moment you get a

good handle on the concept, the film bleeds it away like water from outstretched hands. So too do the characters. Every time you get a firm understanding of who they are, something logical yet wholly unexpected forces you to assess and reassess. No one else best exemplifies this than Sam Rockwell's Office Dixon who goes from a racist Barney Fife to a numbed Travis Bickle with nary a dropped beat to make you question the change. The ensemble carries the film through a lot of ugliness with grace. We

glide uncomfortably close along the sharpened edges of rape, murder, abuse, suicide, alcoholism and racism. All the while questions like: "is it okay to be angry in an unfair world?" and "how do our decisions

affect others," smear into the ashy black comedy and imposing melodrama. Deep care was given to breathe life into these characters.

Even when someone as non-consequential as Charlie's nineteen-year-old girlfriend (Weaving) enters the fray you can't help but admire how these people interact and curious about how they must feel. Martin McDonagh more than ever invites comparisons to the Coen brothers

in this film. A signal that to me at least proves McDonagh is ambitious, but out of his weight class at this point in his career. For while the Coen's approach their films with the same character-first, free-form narratives, there's always a level of benevolence behind the cynicism. Here, instead of smirk-worthy amusement there is anger.

Instead of cosmic curiosity there is more anger. Instead of wonder, there's just more anger, and you know what they say about anger; it just begets more anger. If anger were the spice of life, then this murky soup would definitely

be worth consuming. But as it is not, regular filmgoers should approach this witty, richly rendered film with extreme caution. McDonagh's oeuvre is an acquired taste and those liable to agree with Bachchan's approach to film may walk out severely shook. But for those fixing for

an overall decent barnstorming black comedy, the "Show Me" state might just have something for you.

10

This movie first drew me in because it was an R Rated Black Comedy. As I have been on the lookout for them since watching the Voices, I happily settled to watch this movie. And it was a good thing I did. Firstly, the director, Martin McDonagh, is one of the best I've known, and he did not let me down with this film. He managed to display what he does best, creating a funny movie with a dark backstory. This was as heart moving as it was heart-wrenching. If you needed an example of an oxymoron, this would be the one. Funny and depressing, it tugs at your heartstrings whilst keeping you on a journey of laughter.

The cast, perfect. Being honest, I hadn't heard of France McDormand before. But after this film, I will never forget her. An amazing choice of the dead daughter mother figure, she's stubborn and great. Will be seeing more of her work in time to come. Woody Harrelson and Sam Rockwell have great on-screen chemistry. Unlike McDormand, I am a huge fan of Rockwell, loved his work in the Green Mile and Confessions of a Dangerous Mind and if you aren't a fan of him for whatever reason before this film, you will surely be one after. I'm surprised he managed to sneak in a few dance moves as well, he really stole the show.

So, if you are looking for something to brighten your day, I cannot recommend this enough. As I have said, one of the best dark comedies of our time. Please, watch it, you will not be let down.

6

So far, this film has an IMDb rating of 8.3...and this is extraordinarily high. But the film has been in festivals and I am sure the rating will change some when the film is in general release. As for me, I think it's incredibly overrated.

The story is about an angry mom, Mildred (Frances McDormand). Her daughter was brutally murdered and raped...and the police haven't been able to do anything with the case. So, in desperation and anger, she rents out three billboards and calls the local Police Chief (Woody Harrelson) to task for this. Surprisingly, most of the town comes down against Mildred...who was just exercising her First Amendment rights. What happens from there...well, just see the film.

There were many wonderful scenes and characters in this picture. But, there were also many main characters who were just god-awful and unlikable...including Mildred! In fact, later in the film when she thinks the police department has wronged her, she burns down the building and accidentally flames one of the cops! So, no one who is a main character in the film is nice or likable...making this movie a bit of a hard-sell. Too much cussing (even by 2017 standards), very crude language and overall nastiness prevent this one from being a must- see

[illegible]

7

Page 110

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Because it's kinda artsy, ya'll! ;) Anyway, I liked it, didn't love it, but maybe I will later? I doubt it, but who knows! Know what you are in for, and you will probably like it too!

8

Imagine a film that is part Carrie and part The Exorcist combined with a lesbian love story. I know that sounds a bit confusing but this is a pretty accurate summary of the picture. When the story begins, young Thelma (Eili Harboe) has gone off to college and things seem pretty normal. However, out of the blue, she has what appears to be a grand mal seizure that lands her in the hospital. Soon after, one of the folks who witnessed the seizure, Anja (Kaya Wilkens) introduces herself to Thelma and they soon become friends. In fact, over time they become more than friends as both the women begin having sexual feelings for each other which causes Thelma to have a huge internal struggle because this violates her strong Christian upbringing. A bit later, Thelma enters the hospital for testing to determine exactly whether or not she has epilepsy. During the testing, her defenses are lowered and her intense feelings for Anya run wild so wild that Thelma's supernatural powers manifest themselves. What exactly are these powers? And, what family secrets are there related to all this? And, how does this all end? As I said, the story reminds me of a couple other films but it's also original in many ways. It also keeps you guessing and that's the biggest reason I recommend the picture. Where all this is going and how it gets there make this a very special film, though I have a couple important warnings. First, there are lots and lots of flashing lights and epileptic viewers might have difficulties with this. Second, if you have a strong fear of snakes do not watch this film! There are several snakes in the film but one incredibly vivid dream that is nightmare fodder involving snakes and you need to consider this before you see this excellent movie.

10

Back from the cinema and i am still...wow wow wow. It was just a kinda boring evening, so i took a walk to my favourite cinema in Reykjavik downtown spontaneous. Unfortunately it was the smallest cinema hall but OK i took a set in the middle of the second seat row. So it was like the last seat row in the big cinema hall. Everything was quiet, not many peoples...perfect. And the movie started, first scene, what the hell, OK, curious, interesting and from the beginning to the end, it was just stunning, stunning and stunning. The best movie 2017 i have seen so far!

7

After reading the fantastic reviews and hearing from friends what a great film this was, i went in with big expectations. I was, oddly not to my surprise, a bit let down, and i think others will be too. But that doesn't mean that you shouldn't go out and watch it!

Harboe is the perfect choice for the titular character - every emotion is portrayed with the utmost of believability. Her connection with Anja feels natural and at times entrancing. If Harboe doesn't win an Amanda for Best Actress i'll boycott the award show. Just saying...

The story is engaging, but slow-paced. I don't mind, others might. This is a beautiful piece of art, executed with finesse by Trier. The soundtrack is underscoring the action without adding too much drama, and you've gotta love every moment Susanne Sundfør's music is playing in the background. A perfect fit for this film. The screenplay has a lot of potential, but stumbles here and there. In a way i wish it had been a bit easier on the use of metaphors and symbolism, but at the same time i can't quite grasp what Thelma really is about. Visually, it's stunning - and that's not a given for Norwegian film. But film needs more than stunning photography, cinematography, characters, cgi and music. And that last bit is what's missing here.

Summed up: if you don't like Trier's other films, you might not like this one either. But it's worth the money (!) and your time. Film er best på kino!

10

Lights flicker, the wind rises and animals behave strangely when Thelma becomes agitated. She is capable of mysterious and ethereal powers, and more than she knows because her manipulative and fundamentalist parents keep such things under wraps in home-school. As Thelma heads to college in Oslo and stops taking medications, not only do her parents lose control, she loses control of herself. Psychogenic seizures rack her body. Passions and anxieties multiply along with her abilities. This is when Anja, Thelma's close friend, does something extremely upsetting for Thelma. The next day when Anja can't be found, Thelma has a sickening feeling she had something to do with it. She searches for answers to the secrets and powers that beguile and haunt her.

This thrilling, deep, complex and sensual film explores a whole realm of different theories and possibilities. I was surprised and delighted by its twists and turns. It crosses borders between reality and fantasy, and light and darkness, and explores the good and bad in human nature. The actors are amazing, especially Eili Harboe as Thelma and Kaya Wilkins as Anja. It is fantastic to discover that the roots of psychogenic disorders go back as far as Joan of Arc. Seen at the Toronto International Film Festival.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

[illegible]

Rating: 1

1

Content: 1 , Size: 26

Hey! Have a very nice day.

Rating: 2

2

Content: 2 , Size: 52

I am going outside to play football in this weather.

Rating: 3

3

Content: 3 , Size: 56

Let's get some content from IMDB reviews first shall we?

Rating: 4

4

Content: 4 , Size: 4170

Since the Saw franchise is one of my biggest guilty pleasures when it comes to horror, I've been hoping for a new installment ever since The Final Chapter was supposed to end the franchise back in 2010. Even

though the movies got progressively worse, there is something about this franchise that always draws me back and makes me want to re-watch it.

I had high expectations for Jigsaw because of two reasons: one, the producers stated in an interview that they were offered more than a hundred scripts for a new movie from different writers, but had never been pleased with any of them until they discovered a script so good, which ultimately got picked to be adapted; second, the Spierig brothers, Jigsaw's directors, had previously directed Predestination, such a smart and enticing sci-fi time- travel movie that I liked quite a lot.

After seeing Jigsaw, I left the theater disappointed. I'll start with what I enjoyed:

The score by Charlie Clouser is just as fabulous as it has always been and manages to go in line perfectly with each scene.

The performances didn't bother me at all, although none of the actors really gets to shine. Laura Vandervoort and Paul Braunstein stood out here, with the latter generating some funny moments worthy of admiration.

The direction was very polished and the movie was competently filmed, but the Spierig brothers weren't given much to show their creativity on. This leads me to the negatives.

The CGI is very good. There is, however, one scene in which I was feeling as if I was watching one of the most recent Resident Evil movies and that didn't really work for me.

What I didn't like:

The ideas in this movie and its overall plot are somewhat underdeveloped. I know that this is supposed to be a new beginning for these movies, but as a franchise starter, I wanted more to be explored. The plot falls flat because the movie cuts from scene to scene so swiftly and tries to cram multiple narratives into 85 minutes, that ultimately none of them makes an impact.

Saw is known for its visceral traps and torture devices, so I was looking forward to seeing more of that. However, the game presented in this movie has next to no memorable traps. That is because they are a lot tamer than what we've seen before and they simply can't hold a candle to all the ingenious traps from the past movies.

The character development is another issue in this movie. The characters are so uni-dimensional, with some of them being there only to fill the screen. And I'm referring to some of the main casting here. Also, character arcs are left unfinished and the movie felt like it ended when the most important part of the story was about to happen.

The editing undermines what could've been some very suspenseful scenes because of its sloppiness, by cutting from one narrative (the game) to the other (the investigation) at random moments.

Now, it all comes down to the twist. Was it good and unexpected? Well, no, not really. It's not necessarily because you can predict it from miles away (for which the movie offers hints throughout the run-time) due to its small set of characters, but because it had no resonance for me. It didn't blow me away and you could've predicted it from the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

marketing of the movie alone. Just like with the traps, it just doesn't have the same visceral feel as the past movies and it doesn't really make you crave for the release of the next chapter.

Overall, Jigsaw sets itself apart from the previous movies in the series with the help of the two directors who manage to make the movie look stylish and slick, but ultimately, it doesn't succeed in creating the sense of urgency that some of the old movies had and, sadly, disappoints on almost every other level. And yes, there are fan-service moments, but as a fan of this franchise, I felt very little excitement when they happened.

Hopefully, if the movie does well in terms of box office, the sequel will improve upon this franchise "reinvention".

Rating: 5

6

Content: 5 , Size: 1395

As a saw geek, i thought the film was a good film for an average movie goer, but for a fan of the franchise i found it underwhelming. the "he had another apprentice all along" was lazy in my opinion. The idea Elanor was really Cortbett from saw 3 carrying on jigsaws work (she was around 11 yrs old in saw 3, so the age ties in 7 years on) - this would have been a far more inventive and plausible option than some random character that we are told was on the scene long before Hoffman and Amanda is too weak in my opinion. I also think, making you believe Jigsaw is alive again, only to find out it is scenes from 10 years ago is like giving a kid a Christmas present and taking it away again. However clever, leaves you disappointed. Frustrating. I understand the series needed re-inventing for the new audience, but to forget its old fan base and not have any mention at all of Hoffman, Amanda or Dr Gordon is like ordering Chocolate cake and getting trifle. whilst trifle is nice, its not what you wanted. There are certain rules in a saw film that jigsaw sticks too, well so should the producers.. even if those characters aren't appearing, they should have included someone, even if in name only, especially Dr Gordon as he was alive and well only 7yrs ago and would have known about Logan surely. All in all, a decent film. For a saw fan though its a little disappointing

Rating: 6

8

Content: 6 , Size: 5417

"Let's Play A Game"; those simple words haunted the theaters for years, signaling the start of yet another slasher movie in the Saw series. What started out as a unique twist to the serial killer saga was only the start to a face cringing, spine tingling, sometimes nauseating saga that hooked people in until around the sixth-seventh iteration when it

finally ended. That was until this year, where the saga was to be reanimated in hopes of bringing more bucks to the theaters. Will this eighth installment have the ability to defy death like it's protagonist antihero, or is it dead like the poor victims of his games. Only one way to find out and that is read my friends, so let's get started!

LIKES:

Fast-Pace: With all the slow movies I have been seeing, I give props to

the Saw series maintaining their consistent pace. From start to finish, the tale keeps moving, sparing no second for unnecessary details or attempts at prolonged character development. The mystery of figuring out the identity of the game master, mixed with the spread-out trials that promise a messy end are well-balanced to keep things going.

Decent Characters: A horror movie often has many brain-dead characters begging to be chainsaw fodder. Fortunately, Saw movies continue to choose players who have a little more complexity and skills than many of the Spring Break teens favored. The tradition lives on, as each player has a little more buried within, still having a few obviously destined corpses, but others who have a shot at making it out. And for those not in the game, but trying to solve the mystery, they too have some layers to them that may or may not be pertinent to the story. It's those engaging elements that are crafted in the story, making them more engaging to follow.

The Presentation: Another component I still like is the presentation of

the movie. Many go for the kills, but the better component for me is how they separate the story into two settings. One is still the players trying to escape the closes thing to hell's torture chamber, while the other are the outside characters hunting down the "maniac" that continues to weave his traps. The ability to entangle these two components, balancing their timing to provide clues and hints to the story all while keeping you invested in the game. Such a dynamic presentation provides those checks and balances necessary for a slasher movie, and keeping things as fresh as possible.

Twist: As many of you know, Saw movies are all about the ability to throw that last wrench into the gears to blow your mind. Despite my experience with predicting endings, this one got me. The questions I asked were on the right path, but they were able to drop enough interfering factors to throw me off the trail. Jigsaw once again impresses me with their storytelling, and their mastery of presentation. I can't say much more, but ask the right questions and you might get the answers.

DISLIKES:

Lazy Deaths: Those first few movies were convoluted in their traps.

They had designed devices that were an impressive display of imagination, horror, and engineering that gave everyone a kick in terms of design. While Jigsaw still has the impressive connections and storytelling, it unfortunately fails in the terms of the traps themselves. They are surprisingly simple for the most part, and a little more reserved than I expected in this modern era. Yes, there is still plenty of blood in this battle for moral consequences, but they

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

didn't involve quite as much skin crawling madness.

Acting a little cheesy: Despite the engaging characters, there are times when there are a few inconsistencies in the character's intelligence, or often the case their acting. While decent for the most part, the writers hit some blocks in terms of dialogue or direction they wanted the characters to go. There are those moments the
tension
overwhelms them into hysterical messes that are cheesy rather than believable. In addition, the dialogue sometimes gets lazy, just going into expletives than conducive dialog. A weak dislike yes, but I'm drawing on straws.

The potential for a series: Like the original series, I had hoped for an ending, but then this movie showed up. While I did enjoy it, I am worried that the way this movie ends sets up the potential for a new series to start. Sure, this means more Saw goodness, but it also means the potential to dilute this movie into another run of the mill series that will become a product of lazy producing. Hopefully that won't happen, but these days series are the prize most companies seek.

The VERDICT:

Jigsaw is the piece of the puzzle that brings quality back to the lovely massacre series. Going back to the roots, the writers were able to bring back a brilliant presentation and characters you can follow. All the nostalgic qualities rush in with the deadly traps, bringing that fast-pace, twisting tale that captivated us all those years ago. While still not the first movie, especially in terms of death design and potential to revive the series, it was a welcome addition to the series. So, if you are looking for the horror movie of the month, Jigsaw is your answer for the theater my friends.

My scores:

Crime/Horror/Mystery: 8.5 Movie Overall: 7.0

Rating: 7

9

Content: 7 , Size: 617

Jigsaw doesn't have over the top traps, where you chop off your arm (Saw VI). OR impossible traps where you put your hand in a jar of acid to retrieve a key just to get your chest ripped open (Saw III). History repeats itself and Jigsaw goes back to their old roots being simple, with basic traps and a mind blowing ending. Unfortunately there's one trap I disliked, it involves lasers. It relies on CGI too much, the stakes are high but the practical traps are way more fun and creative. With wires, tricks, chains, a puppet and the classic pig head, this film will leave you with a smile on your face.

Rating: 8

7

Content: 8 , Size: 1134

October 26, 2017 Middle East Premiere Dubai

It's been 10 years since the death of John Kramer known as the Jigsaw.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

But, some bodies are discovered, the investigation leads to the conclusion that Kramer is back...!! Now, the Officials are chasing the dead.

Saw released in 2004 was one of the best Gore, Slasher Suspense Horror Thrillers. After the completion of film school, Director James Wan with his friend Leigh Whannell wanted to make a short film, but limitations hold their hands. Hence, they decided to make something that has limited location, actors etc. This short film of 9 minutes gave green signal to the Saw movie. But, the franchise was rated straight down from Part 1 to 7.

This movie is from the Directors of Predestination (2014), Spierig Brothers... hold on, don't expect much. But, if you are a fan of Saw film, you can take a breath. Definitely this is not as bad as the previous installments.

Mostly, a cocktail of the previous films. The beginning was really good, it had hope and expectations about the movie. This dropped soon. But, managed to pick up towards the end.

Rating: 9

6

Content: 9 , Size: 3222

Jigsaw is back for an eighth film after several years from the conclusion of a terrible supposedly final chapter saw movie. Jigsaw is an okay film, its not terrible neither good. With directors The Spierig Brothers direction and a new set of writers trying to bring back the Jigsaw killer. There was a way of continuing on with the franchise either with a new twists that tries to bring back the torture porn of death traps and either a new killer or perhaps Jigsaw's legacy was not over.

I enjoyed the first few Saw films from the bloody gory death traps, the connection on how every victim has with each other, and the twists that is played with Charlie Clouser's music theme in the final minute of the movies. As every film goes on, it just feels like they straying away from the plots connection and having new victims that has no connections and more bloody traps. Jigsaw film however, does not feel like a Saw movie. The plot feels more like a police procedural drama, were Det. Halloran (Callum Keith Rennie) is following up a case were bodies are discovered. And same with the video tapes of Jigsaw's voice (Tobin Bell). Is the Jigsaw really dead? Or is there a new Jigsaw copycat that is taking over his games? Halloran is trying to follow a lead that has several people playing the game in a hidden barn. Were they are fighting for their lives of going through several death traps, as they are suppose to solve the clues to why they are there. With the help from forensic pathologist Logan and Eleanor (Matt Passmore and Hannah Emily Anderson). They are trying to solve their own mystery when traces of evidence is leading back to Jigsaw being alive and the connections every victim has with each other.

The plot played like a TV police procedural drama which took away from

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

the Saw movies feel. It was fun to see Halloran trying to solve the mystery with the victims and Jigsaw. And then the movie flashes back to the victims in the barn, who are forced to play a game that will end bloody.

The death traps and the bloody sequences are quick and less gory than the previous seven films. And the traps are also quite forgettable this time. Sure, for the audience that can not handle blood and gore will still find this disturbing.

There are also a couple of unpredictable twists that works with the film and is what leaves you talking about it. Definitely not as great as the first film. The cast was also decent. Matt Passmore is a fun new addition. Callum Keith Rennie was okay. And the cast of victims that were forced in death traps are not easily memorable.

Like all horror films, the first couple are usually the best and the rest are just repeats with less of a plot. And this film does not add or bring anything new to the direction of the franchise. Overall, Jigsaw is a fair horror film. The twists works well. The thrills is decent with the victims being forced to injure themselves to survive. The plot does not feel like the Saw movies. And the death traps are forgettable.

I rate the film 3 out of 5 stars. I ll recommend it if you want to watch a bloody torture porn film or if your into that. Otherwise, I ll suggest it as a rental.

Rating: 10

7

Content: 10 , Size: 617

I have seen the first 3 movies in the series as the reviews of the successors were not good. But I am happy that they made reference to these movies. And this time no flashbacks!

The production design and visuals (gore and blood) were genuine for the viewer to believe. The traps are quite forgettable this time but the twists and turns were very good as I didn't see that coming in the end.

An attempt being made by the directors to make it comparable with the first two installments. Though there are some flaws in the middle, but the ending justified the shortcomings!

Worth your money!

Rating: 11

7

Content: 11 , Size: 1175

I'm fan of Saw franchise since I was teenager, so my hype about this new entry was so high. The movie has 2 plots, one showing 5 victims needing to survive to the dangerous games of Jigsaw and other telling us the story about a police department investigating some stranger homicides.

The plot about the surviving group is nice, there are some creative

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

traps, however there's less violence and bloody scenes than in the previous entries and also has some plot holes, for example Jigsaw seems to know who would survive since the beginning. During the middle of the movie I was wondering "how's possible Jigsaw recorded a tape with the name of that character? How he knows that character is alive? He could die during the beginning of the game". Meanwhile, the plot about the polices gives us some great twists and I'm sure you won't see them coming.

Jigsaw is a sequel with some reboot elements, doesn't change the horror genre, but is funny and I suggest it for who wants to turn off the brain for 90 minutes and just enjoy a nice movie. It's not the best Saw film, however is one of the bests.

Rating: 12

6

Content: 12 , Size: 943

I was a huge fan of the original series, although as more films were released the thrill lessened. The first is a Classic and may have one of the best twists of all time, and that's what makes it such a great film. It wasn't about the horror.

This one, although entertaining, same awkward acting by many characters, same grizzly traps, and most of all a twist, which I believe everyone expects, however I feel there's some major plot holes that leaves me feeling dissatisfied. Of course I won't ruin for anyone, but this film reaches far, way too far, in my humble opinion.

Very reminiscent of the original, but fails in the end. Maybe they'll do better next time because a new Saw film is always welcome to take a swing.

Note: the red headed coroner was super hot, even before she let her hair down and took her glasses off. Way too hot to be a coroner. (not being sexist, just keeping it real)

Rating: 13

6

Content: 13 , Size: 1551

Saw is back and Jigsaw has returned to reclaim Halloween. But, you'll immediately find yourself confused. After all, Jigsaw has been dead for many years. As soon as you start watching a lot of things just don't make even a hint of sense. Everything seems jumbled up... until the film's many twists and turns become clear and, with yet another rising crescendo of the iconic theme tune, a series of flashbacks, big reveals and gory images, a Saw film once more concludes seemingly laughing at its audience and said audience will once more leave feeling sick to the stomach and very confused. Yep, Saw is back... for better or for worse? In this case, for better. Kind of. After the horrendous last installment, the only good part of Jigsaw's legacy was the roller coaster at Thorpe Park. Now... maybe things could be back on track. It

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

hasn't redeemed the franchise; the usual bad acting, logic gaps and lack of genuine scares still applies. But at the same time, this installment prioritizes thought provoking moral themes and tension over gore and flashbacks and it is an intense, unsettling experience. With memorable death scenes, a reasonable amount of tension and a relatively solid plot, this should be satisfying enough to most. It doesn't entirely feel like Saw since virtually no-one, not even those still alive, returns from the previous films and the grimy, unclean atmosphere of the old films is replaced by a cleaner, more high-tech vibe, but many will like the various nods to the past movies.

6/10

Rating: 14

9

Content: 14 , Size: 426

Very enjoyable saw movie with more backstory. Kinda funny at times but still just as sick and twisted with plenty of blood and guts. You gotta love the bucket heads, an instant saw classic trap. Ending was mind blowing as always and I'm glad to see saw going back to it's roots. Can't wait to see where this new trilogy will go. If you have seen the first seven saw films you definitely have to see this one!

Rating: 15

6

Content: 15 , Size: 3121

It would be totally fine if SAW franchise had ended at the 7th installment, however, I don't mind that there's a new one, let's break down why

Jigsaw is the 8th installment, and surprisingly, it's not that bad, but it's kind of unnecessary and doesn't feel warranted

It does have it's positives

They have changed some things especially the visual style. When the trailer came out, i was disappointed that they had done away the gritty look of the previous SAW films and are bringing a new cleaner visual style that felt a little less scary but after watching the film, i have to say, the visual style is a breathe of fresh air and a nice change up

Another good thing is that the film focuses less on the torture porn aspect and instead it focuses more on solving the puzzle aspect of the traps. They have toned down the violence, but i'm okay with that because they did focus on making the traps more of a challenge instead of a torture. But if we talk about the traps, yes there were a very few maybe one or two original and innovative traps but the rest were very uninspired and a less gore-y versions of some traps from previous SAW films

The film does have a cool and unexpected turn of events. There's an interesting mystery going on and an intriguing "whodunnit" story line

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

that keeps you guessing

Let's get down to negatives

I know that the directors of this film, Spierig brothers are good at their jobs and they know how to make a film and i really liked their previous film that was Predestination but here, even though they showed that they understood the basis and core aspects of SAW franchise, they could not manage to deliver anything too impressive or anything we haven't seen before except the overall change of tone and visual style

The writing is mediocre, but like i said it does have some cool twists that you may not see coming, it still is very cliché and mediocre. Like always, there is excessive use of flashbacks to tell many parts of the story, which may not be a negative but excessive use is excessive and can be considered lazy at times

I've seen critics mentioning the cringe-y acting and i agree that in many scenes, some acting is very over the top and a bit cringe-y

Wrapping up the review, i would say, Jigsaw is not as good as it could have been but its not the worst of the franchise. In fact, it may be like the 4th or 5th best film in the SAW series if i had to rank them in terms of quality

I do appreciate that Jigsaw combines some of the best ideas of some SAW films and delivers some good moments but it barely does anything to justify its existence beyond making more money for the franchise

If you like most of the SAW films, you may enjoy this one too. Even if you only like the first few SAW films, i would say give this a chance if you want to, you may end up liking it. It's an easy watch with a small run time that doesn't drag too much and it's very fast paced.

i would give it 6/10

Rating: 16

6

Content: 16 , Size: 3247

This one upset me. This was the most engaging saw film since 1. Loved the detective/crime story as usual and FOR ONCE I wasn't subjected to just gory nonsense. It's a bit gruesome and grisly due to the morgue photos and dead bodies - oh yes there was blood - but they saved the big gore till the end as a payoff. Loved it up until the end where it all falls apart.

The ending itself was stupid. I would have laughed at the killers final line (it's so PATHETIC compared to saw 1's & game over;) but I was sitting there with jaw on the floor from how BAD the ending was. Ruined everything. I even forgave the lapses in logic cuz it's saw and when saw is good - it's fun. I thought the traps were well done and the silo trap was the best since maybe the shotgun tilt a whirl of 6. Too many things unanswered, some missing characters...

SPOILERS

I thought the main chick was gonna be Jeff's daughter - and she wasn't so I was really upset about that lol When the killer is revealed I was dumbfounded... I liked the cast a lot and thought it was well written

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

on the whole but just all comes apart at the reveal. Tobin's scene was great - the highlight of the movie. I guessed that the game had already happened - seemed obvious right?

What happened to Ella(?) and what happened to one leg guy? I thought

tobin was dr. gordon at first - then I remembered it already happened - but where is he? Where's Hoffman? I loved the cancer diagnosis angle - that was great but I was really hoping we'd find out her last name was Denlan. I ended my fan edit of all films in one long ass movie with the
don't trust the one who saves you part... I really thought that was where they were gonna go - with Jeff's daughter...oh well.

END OF SPOILERS

In the end they got a lot right but the wrong ruined what was the best

one (maybe 3rd best) after the original. Really disappointed and I have no idea how to include it my fan edit cuz it almost seems insulting to put it in cuz it has nothing to do with series almost. A real WASTE of a good ride.

I think the blade on this saw has finally dulled - this new direction

just seems like it will ruin the original series. That's what's SO maddening about this movie - I loved it until the end. It was MORE than making up for the unwatchable POS that was 7.

So can I say watch it? Yeah but it will disappoint you but the ride is

worthy enough if we still had videos stores. Watch when it comes on TV is vague and it sounds stupid. Wait for it on video was always an easy good review lol

I'd rank the films from best to last -

Saw (4 stars - a classic in it's own way) Saw VI (4 stars - great sequel) Saw IV (3 1/2 stars. Best twist in the series. best misdirection) Saw III (3 1/2 stars - it's just SO bloody and mean and nasty. A real mean spirited movie) Saw II (3 stars - good sequel. still fun)

Saw V (**1/2) I like it but only works as a piece and not it's own movie) Jigsaw (** stars) Almost best since original - terrible ending) Saw VII - utter trash. Used about 12 mins of it in my edit lol

Peace.

Rating: 17

6

Content: 17 , Size: 914

I am in a unique position because I would not have chosen to go and see this movie. I was invited to it for a friends birthday, I can give you my honest opinion with no prior experience\expectations with the franchise.

Not once did I feel I was missing out having not knowing the series, As

a stand alone movie it did well misdirecting suspicion in some parts. However in a lot of movie I found myself telegraphing what was going to happen and knowing what was there for a second viewing which I like to be in the dark for until the second time round. I can forgive this cause there won't be a next time. The people I was with all said the same thing... The first was the best, and the movies went downhill until this one. The acting was good the effects were better.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

However, the twist at the end was a masterpiece I will give it that. No one could have seen that coming.

Rating: 18

10

Content: 18 , Size: 1011

I was very excited when the first jigsaw trailer was online and my hopes were extremely high. When the film premiered I immediately went to see it and my god I was mind blown by the plot and characters. Like previous saw films the story is some what the same with a few added twist to each characters background. The puppet looks very awesome with new features added and Tobin bell still does the voice of him which was very amazing. I finally happy to see films like this getting back to what the term HORROR is frankly there hasn't been any good horror films that were great. Mainly nowadays horror films tend to be you're typical tacky cliché; jumpscare gimmick with annoying loud banging sound and mainly focusing on cheap demon/ ghost filth & the conjuring, the babadook, bye bye man, ouija, sinister, oculus, paranormal activity and those dreadful insidious films. Finally horror movies are getting back to it roots of pure horror because humans are the one that you should be scared.

Rating: 19

6

Content: 19 , Size: 1450

There will be spoilers in the last paragraph.

When I saw the first trailer I was stoked on seeing it first. Now that I've seen it, it brought some pretty disappointing moments where I wanted the series to be changed.

First off I wanted to see more unanswered plot holes from Saw The Final Chapter like why some people were involved and stuff. Second, I thought they would be adding more modern technology in the mix. Third, I expected a whole new feeling to the film that was different from the others. Finally fourth, I wanted Waaaaay more mystery and drama.

Although this film didn't meet my expectations it's still ranking 3 out of all the saw movies. There was nothing new and if they are to make a sequel they better add something new to the series. I gave it a 6/10 for it's come back to the series, it's new traps, and it's twist I SAW coming. We need a new Jig from the series c'mon!

!SPOILER! I easily saw 2/3rds of the plot coming when they first mentioned the spiral trap and the rumor he used it before every other one of his victims. Also I knew it was that dude who faked him dying by the lasers because we've seen it before in Saw 1, also because they found skin sampled in his freezer. Ultimately the twist was pretty easy to see. Sorry to bring your hopes down but they should've left it

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Saw:Legacy and made JIGSAW a new, brighter, more innovative movie after.

Rating: 20

10

Content: 20 , Size: 480

I'm a huge fan of the Saw franchise & I never saw this coming a Prequel an a Sequel all rolled into one , my mind is blown away . Jigsaw is brilliantly written as they all are , the traps are especially good & the twist was incredible & spoiler coming that we were watching a prequel game all along ! and the reveal of Jigsaw so we think he's alive ! my jaw was on the floor ! the 7 years has been worth the wait as Jigsaw exceeded my expectation .

Rating: 21

6

Content: 21 , Size: 897

I agree that JIGSAW is an unnecessary sequel in the SAW franchise, but if I'm honest the whole series has been unnecessary, aside from the first movie. This one's a densely-plotted lukewarm rehash of previous sequels and ideas, with five characters engaging in more against-the-clock deadly traps while the detectives on the outside attempt to figure out whether the killer Jigsaw really is back and on the prowl again.

As with the sequels, this is pretty confusing stuff although it all

makes sense towards the end, although I wasn't all that convinced by some of the twists. An aged Tobin Bell returns to his role (thanks to one of the aforementioned twists) and is a welcome presence, and the traps are gruesome and nasty, although not the most inventive of the franchise. All together, this is acceptable fare, although not a film you'll want to bother revisiting.

Rating: 22

6

Content: 22 , Size: 4199

The Saw franchise went downhill since the original back in 2004. Though it was assumed to have ended in 2010, another sequel has arrived seven years later. My main concern with this was the fact that it was probably going to end up being another film that's made for fans of violence and gore, who enjoy this series just for the traps and who makes it out alive. While Jigsaw is exactly that, there are many more layers to this film than I was expecting, making for a somewhat enjoyable viewing experience. I won't be recommending this movie to anyone who has never seen a previous installment, nor will I recommend it to those who have and have disliked it from the beginning. Jigsaw

isn't going to win any new fans over, but in terms of popcorn horror entertainment, I think you can still do much worse than Jigsaw. It tries very hard to please hardcore fans, and I truly believe that it does so. This really isn't all that great of a movie, but let's dive into why it's better than it deserves to be.

Like always, you follow the police as they try to solve the mystery of the ongoing puzzle so that they can try and save as many lives as possible. These films exist for their traps nowadays, but I have to give credit where credit is due and offer some applause to the neat little twists this movie pulls off throughout its final act. Like most of these sequels, the twists are too little and too late, but you can tell that the writers care about trying to give the audience a little more than just killing people in inventive ways.

The characters throughout this film receive some backstory, but that's also the biggest issue I had with this movie as a whole. Looking back on it, I appreciate the fact that each of the characters throughout the core game was fleshed out more than I was expecting them to be, but they honestly make you hate every one of the players, which was a huge distraction from me, having absolutely nobody to root for. Yes, the majority of these movies are like that, but there was always someone to latch onto, hoping they would make it out alive. Instead, we receive a slew of characters that have all made terrible decisions in the past, forcing you to slightly be okay with what the killer is doing to them.

Although I didn't care about any of the characters, Jigsaw found a way to win me over in the end, with a few very clever reveals, making the characters themselves seem less relevant anyway. You don't go into a Saw movie to see fleshed out characters, but when a movie can ground itself and invest you even in the slightest, points can be given for that. The character of John Kramer is the character who's fleshed out the most here, giving a small, but detailed level to the franchise itself, which was quite the surprise for me.

The deaths themselves are pretty impressive in terms of being memorable because everything from Saw IV to Saw VII is a complete blur to me. I'll be remembering some of the set pieces when looking back on Jigsaw and that's easily more than I was able to say about most of the sequels that this franchise has offered through the years. There are nods to previous deaths throughout some of the games and there's definitely a reason behind that, which makes it worth waiting until the end.

Overall, like I said, Jigsaw won't win over any new viewers, but fans of the franchise will be able to appreciate the cleverness that it has to offer when it ties itself into the timeline of the series. The dialogue is very generic, the story itself isn't anything you haven't already seen, and the characters are extremely forgettable. That being said, the traps are fun, the conclusion is satisfying for those who have followed the series from the beginning, and the spirit of the original is still present enough to warrant a recommendation for hardcore fans. Jigsaw works for what it sets out to achieve, but it's

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

still the same old schtick. I had a fun time with this movie because I've seen every other film in the franchise and I still found this one of the best. It's really not that bad in retrospect.

Rating: 23

8

Content: 23 , Size: 1154

So it has been a long time since a Saw film came out but this was certainly worth the wait. Jigsaw is not very scary but it isn't trying to be. It is a smart and fun entry that modernizes the Saw franchise. It was REALLY cool to see Tobin Bell on the big screen again, like that guy is so freakin cool! The characters range from cool to not cool, but the worst character is the one who survives! It's the person you wanted to see die the most, yet he walks out A-OKAY. These Saw movies have a knack for doing that! The gore in this movie is INCREDIBLE and features downright the BEST gore moment of the entire Saw franchise, where a guy's head is split down the middle like an apple slicer. It had me cheering, because it is not only the best gore moment in the entire Saw franchise but one of the best gory moments I've ever seen in theaters! The twist at the end sent chills down my spine, like wow I never would've guessed it and it made so much sense too. I was so happy this film was good. I would probably rank it in fourth place behind Saw 1, 2, and 3, and it ties with Saw 6. I would recommend you buy a ticket tonight!

Rating: 24

4

Content: 24 , Size: 383

Hollywood's cash cow advantage for Halloween. The traps were meh. Too tamed compared to other saw movies. The twist at the end was awful nearly the whole movie turns out to be one big flashback. Flashbacks are starting to become an annoying cliché; both in movies and TV series. It's a sequel that didn't need to be made. I recommend not bothering with this one.

Rating: 25

8

Content: 25 , Size: 746

REVIEW - JIGSAW

Who remembers the very first Saw film and how through the course of the many films the whole premise seemed to get lost to the investigation.

The premise that it was a game with an outcome you could choose.

In many ways this latest installment returns to the original premise but.....

Generally a good (not great) film but certainly worth your time.

One or two plot holes which of course I will not give away.

My

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

biggest problem with the film is why? As with Ghost In The Machine, why tell us the complete story in one film, why not leave us wanting more?

The above doesn't generally spoil the film which does have a lot of twists and turns.

Rating 8 out of 10

Rating: 26

7

Content: 26 , Size: 1452

I saw Jigsaw, starring Tobin Bell-24_tv, The Quick and the Dead; Matt Passmore-The Glades_tv, Son of the Mask; Callum Keith Rennie-Longmire_tv, Fifty Shades of Grey and Laura Vandervoort-Ted, Smallville_tv. This is the 8th movie in the Saw franchise and yes, I know, the last one back in 2010 was called the final chapter but he's back-you just can't keep a good man down. This is the first Saw movie that has the character's name, Jigsaw, in the title. What is remarkable to me is that Jigsaw/Tobin was killed off in the third Saw movie but the producers keep coming up with ways for him to make an appearance-and yes, they have an explanation here, too. This one starts with bodies turning up dead and all the evidence points to one man as being responsible, Tobin. Callum is the lucky policeman that gets to try and match wits with Tobin. Matt plays the medical examiner that gets to autopsy all the dead bodies showing up-and some of them are in pretty bad shape. Laura is one of the lucky contestants that gets to play Tobin's games, and yes, they are just as gruesome as always. Now I know that these movies are not for everyone-my wife hates them-but if you do like them, then you will probably enjoy this one, too. I know I did. It's rated R for grisly bloody violence, torture and language and has a running time of 1 hour & 31 minutes. I enjoyed it and would buy it on DVD.

Rating: 27

10

Content: 27 , Size: 345

The best horror movie in the world with this section as well he showed me that he was still brilliant. The story is well designed, a sight is a flawless point as we like :) I have no idea how much idiot critic instead of shutting down everything why they do not settle down movie? I find it outrageous to get rid of movies that are not should.

Rating: 28

5

Content: 28 , Size: 1577

So,tonight Jigsaw premiered in my cinema and for some reason,the cinema room was empty,so,that was OK,I was alone. The film followed the story

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

of another guilty bunch who are pursued in to a game of grisly games as the new killer may actually be Jigsaw himself, yes, Jigsaw. So, I actually kind of wished I did not have to see this, I had already gone on a big shopping spree with my family, surprising me due to it being my birthday and afterwards, I was wrecked..but, for you guys, I saw it! The opening scene in Jigsaw made me actually wanna fall asleep, I was really tired but sat through the whole thing and was it worth it..not really. I kind of wished to be honest, I did not see Jigsaw, wasting money on myself, the film was just another crappy Saw film, well, not too crappy. Jigsaw was not really all that bad, I thought the traps though were kind of poor having it have the exact same kind of theme of traps to Saw V, one thing though I did love about this film was the ending that really had me like..what?! I won't spoil, but it was a brilliant ending, the acting in the film was OK, something that was weird was the setting, I felt also that this was not even a Saw film, when you think about the first seven having been set in old dungeons and stuff, this had barley any resemblance to it which is something that I admired, the actual very ending to the film was OK with that trap at the end being definitely crap, I mean, like there's bad traps, but the laser one..OH MY GOD!! Jigsaw is a mixed sequel with good things and bad things but at the end of the day, will Saw ever change?

Rating: 29

6

Content: 29 , Size: 5731

From 2004 to 2010, we were greeted with a Saw film once every Halloween. Each film built on the foundation of the previous film, literally deeming them as iterations of one another. Now that time has past between films and new films and ideas have come out since then in the torture porn genre (I hate using that phrase, especially to describe the first film), new ground had to be broken. There are die-hard Saw fans like myself who know most every little intricacy of the first seven films, but nobody cares about the old formula anymore. It tired itself out. Instead of reiterating, it was now time to innovate. Enter co-writers Josh Stolberg & Pete Goldfinger and co-directors Michael & Peter Spierig, and in Halloween of 2017 you get Jigsaw.

All of this follows an eerily similar path to the Jurassic Park franchise. JP had sequels that, while in-name they hold their own, after a while started turn away some moviegoers and even got close to jumping the shark if it continued down the beaten path. So they created some space between themselves for some years, and came back with a re-branding. Both films (Jigsaw and Jurassic World) serve as standalone films if you so want to treat them as such or jump into them anew, play off their respective first films in terms of content and paying proper homage, modernize themselves and play more to a general casual audience (Jigsaw domestically, JW globally), can and probably will churn out its own set of sequels, and let veterans of the franchises appreciate the

small bits that played off any one of the previous installments. Jurassic World lives in a PG-13 setting though and caved in to more Hollywood tropes (including CGI), plus is a much higher budget film, but Jigsaw still breaks a lot of new ground that will not play familiarly to the Saw films of old.

When Darren Lynn Bousman jumped on board to direct Saw II, he noted in the commentary track what some of the 'staples' were for the franchise, including quick-cuts. While I don't agree with that assessment, this continued for his next two films in the franchise, and directors David Hackl and Kevin Greutert followed up with a similar format. The films also found themselves in flashback haven, remained almost exclusively within interior settings, and centralized a set of characters to connect within a small universe. Jigsaw opens up to the feeling that this is taking place in a larger city and environment, letting characters in and out of the games explore more and be realer people (in that they do not just serve the purpose of the film alone, like they have lives outside of what we see). The framing of the film has changed, the color palette has widened, Charlie Clouser's score is not as in-your-face, and the production simply doesn't feel as cheap. Right steps were made in making this film much more accessible, and I see this continuing in the future.

While Jurassic World actually seems to remove the sequels from canon (we will see if that's true with Jeff Goldblum's appearance in Fallen Kingdom), Jigsaw plays strongly in the sense that if you go without seeing, recalling, or keeping in mind Saw 4-7, you will be okay. Hoffman is completely out of the picture in Jigsaw, never once mentioned or concerned about. The only traits to be aware of in those films was that John lost a child, was once in a relationship with Jill Tuck, and there was an autopsy performed on his body. In fact, you could just as easily disregard specifics about Saw II and Saw III, and you will probably be okay. Knowing that John Kramer was killed in the third film just might be enough.

This one really mostly plays off the first film to be most effective, though. Aside from the elaborateness of the traps and games being made (which could transition more smoothly seeing the other seven films first), we can leave the first film understanding that a cancer-stricken individual puts victims in life-or-death scenarios because of moral sins they have committed, and if killed get a puzzle piece cut out of their bodies. Seasoned individuals will also find some of the twists in the new film somewhat predictable simply because they know how Jigsaw thinks (or really, how the writers think). There were over a half-dozen twists, and I probably guessed or suspected the majority of them. Didn't make the film any inferior because I'm sitting and thinking about the casual moviegoer experiencing this film, and I think the best thing you can do for yourself now is at least see the first film and heck even at most know the outcome of the original trilogy. Saw IV, V, VI and The Final Chapter now all end up being fan-service flicks, unless any Jigsaw sequels end up coming back to them more than

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

they have now.

I liked this movie. It could've been a complete garbage escapade like

the seventh film was, and it wasn't. This reignites the franchise after it had stalled out and breathes fresh air. Maybe we will get a couple more within the next few Halloweens, because there is something to explore but I don't know how they'll want to do it. It is up to their creative bones now, and I like that facet of it because they can make good films if they try their darnedest in doing so.

If this film interests you enough that you want to give the first film

a chance and haven't yet, go to Netflix right now to check it out, consider completing the original trilogy if you loved it enough to see what happens next, and check out this film when you're able to. I've reached my 1000-word limit, so now I'll just leave you here with my franchise ranking:

1, 3, 6, 2, J, 5, 4, 7

Rating: 30

6

Content: 30 , Size: 657

For me the best thing about sequel is the unity. Each one of them complete the others missing parts. This one is totally apart from the rest

About movie, thriller wasn't enough, traps wasn't excited, spilled

blood wasn't enough.

Storyline seem like rushed, was weak. I expected much more. Was

disappointing for me.

At the end i waited for "Game over" with shutted door. At least don't

take it away from me right. But they did.

Worst one of the sequel for me . Sorry about that. It is disgrace for

John's legacy.

By the way Laura Vandervoort your color is the brown thrust me 3C;3

Rating: 31

1

Content: 31 , Size: 344

Worst hour and a half of my life. That's all that needs to be said but since IMDb requires you to write 5 lines in a review I'll explain why. Firstly, it was horrible. I didn't find it thrilling at any point and the story line was just confusing and not good. I definitely could of written a better movie when I was in grade 3.

Rating: 32

9

Content: 32 , Size: 1991

Even though people rarely admit it, the "Saw" series has been one of the highest quality horror series ever made. "Jigsaw" is the eighth

entry in the series and there is still yet to be a bad film made amongst them. Some are undoubtedly better than others, but I defy you to point me out one that is inherently bad. I also defy you to show me another horror series (even any type of series at all is rare) that has maintained quality across that many films. That's why I was so happy that 'Jigsaw' was a brilliant movie, because if they had come back seven years later only to put forward a bad film for the sake of making money it would have ruined everything. Luckily that was not the case though.

While this one does follow the formula used in all the past films, it also feels quite unique in a number of ways. The original seven films were all set within a very tight time-frame. This one of course is pushing ten years into the future. This adds layers of intrigue to the proceedings, because how could 'Jigsaw' be committing these crimes when he died all those years back? And you just know they're going to have a brilliant answer to that question.

As far as the traps go in this one, I'm not too sure how I feel. None of them were bad, however none of them really blew me away either. My favourite one (without giving away any spoilers) was actually the most simple one in the film involving a gun. The psychology behind that one is what I loved. I love when these films aren't afraid to be intelligent.

The twist in this one also caught me completely off-guard. I've heard people say they weren't entirely convinced by it and felt that the film cheated, however I disagree. Nothing is off limits coming in a 'Saw' movie. You have to know that going in. Altogether I absolutely loved this film and would thoroughly recommend it to anyone who is in anyway interested in the genre.

Rating: 33

6

Content: 33 , Size: 1487

Saw has had many ups and downs as a series. The 'final chapter' in 2010 was about as limp as soggy bread, giving us nothing shocking and a long-expected twist.

Jigsaw begins anew (don't expect Hoffman or Dr. Gordon to return) and

features new characters and a new set of games. But...how can this be if John Kramer died over ten years ago? Is he really dead? He has to be. Right?

There are definite improvements here. The cinematography and production

design is light years beyond the previous movies. I used to refer to Saw having 'faketography' with some of the rudest, ugliest, and cheapest filters and color corrections ever to dirty the big screen. Jigsaw, being the first to be shot in 2.35:1, actually looks cinematic and it's the film's best feature. The games and traps themselves are gruesome but not overplayed, which took the focus away from torture porn and gave it a bit more of the psychological edge we got in the first movie.

Sadly, it fails elsewhere. The story gives us YET MORE cops, YET

MORE

coroners, and YET MORE doctors (all of them forgettable) filling up the side story. Sorry, but after a seven-year hiatus this should have been more unique and subversive. I gotta admit though, that twist ending had me kicking myself, and Charlie Clouser's score is as intense as ever.

Not a bad film, but not the huge comeback it should have been. I rank it somewhere in the middle of the series overall.

Rating: 34

10

Content: 34 , Size: 300

What can I say? As a huge SAW fan I was so exited for this movie. It didn't disappoint me at all! Great actors, great traps, gorgeous music.. And last but not least, a thrilling story and spine-chilling feeling through the whole movie! A golden comeback for the franchise! Great job Lionsgate!

Rating: 35

5

Content: 35 , Size: 813

I love the Saw movies don't get me wrong, but this movie although it was filmed very well and even had its funny cool moments just seemed like a repeat of something that was already seen. Do not get me wrong I loved seeing the new torture devices, but to see how each of them died and it ended up with no one winning, but finding out Jigsaw saved and trained another person seemed very predictable and overrated. I think this movie would have been awesome if turned out Jigsaw did not actually die and came back with an even more serious vengeance and did not give people a chance, but killed them in his own selective way and the last one to survive had a chance to save their own life. As far as the ending for this movie I thought was predictable and repeated. This movie could have been so much better.

Rating: 36

10

Content: 36 , Size: 891

Of course, its not my favorite part of this fantastic movie,BUT!I think everybody knows,that a lot of movies which has continuation, becoming more and more boring part by part.For example Pirates of Caribbean sea. i don't so like first 35m of movie.I saw it few hours ago,and at first 35 m i was thinking that - Oh no,please,lets something happen,because i have feeling,that it will be another movie,which makes me boring after his older parts,but this part,i can say,that makes me feel,what i was feeling after first,second and sixth parts...when you are starting to think after the end of movie....and for me this is one of the best

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

continuation parts i have ever seen.Sure,there are a lot of not logical moments,but steel,for 8th part its brilliant work.Please make 9th part better...make Cramer alive,because you open that idea in 8th part....thank you for not boring continuation.

Rating: 37

3

Content: 37 , Size: 1509

Right I am a big fan of this franchise... A real big fan so that when I was at the school I even made a film that is inspired by the franchise... Even though I am not proud of the film considering it was tight on budget and time Eventually it was shown at numerous film festivals around the world because it was catchy, commercial and current..

So last week after seeing Jigsaw I was shocked to see my plot being turned into feature length script,shot and presented to me in the cinema...

Some might call this as plot similarity which I doubt... As even the writers made the same mistakes as I did... (Those flat characters in Jigsaw... In a short film I had limited time to establish a character anyway)

Secondly Both mine and Jigsaw twists the time... Which is the main similarity... Which means the bodywork of the films are literally the SAME...

Second thing to note is at first those bucket heads did not mean a lot to me... Why they were there to begin with... Until I spot the first similarity about the plot...

Literally my work is inspired from ice bucket challenge... So you now know where those bucket heads are coming from...

Interesting coincidence one might even doubt if it is a coincidence or an indirect COPY & PASTE product...

you can check my short on youtube under Game Of Death Terms &
Conditions short film if you are a writer it would be easy for you to understand the similarities...

let me know what you think...

Rating: 38

9

Content: 38 , Size: 347

This saw movie was actually one of the best ones. This movie had its scary moments and its funny moments, I give it a 9/10 because i have been waiting for a long time, I actually got to learn what happened after all these years but disappointing because Gordon and Hoffman weren't revealed. We still don't know what happened to them :(

Rating: 39

9

Content: 39 , Size: 854

If you love horror/thriller type of movies you must have seen at least one of Saw movies. It's been 7 years since the last Saw movie and with this one Jigsaw makes a great comeback. Like all Saw movies this one is also tied with the other ones and also gives you a new perspective about the previous ones. The plot looks simple at first. Looking like a classic John Kramer game where he wants justice and trying to teach a lesson to his chosen players. But as the movie continues it gets more complicated and it keeps you on the edge of your seat which is great. And as we get to climax part of the movie the legendary Saw music starts playing and all of the things that you are confused about is explained and you're just left with an open mouth. Because the plot twist is really good and a clever one. So i think this is a really must see!!

Rating: 40

6

Content: 40 , Size: 1974

Tyler Perry is something of an American phenomenon; a one-man motion picture industry. As a director, writer, or producer; and frequently all three; Perry since 2005 has been responsible for some twenty remarkably successful motion pictures. And that's in addition to the pictures of other filmmakers in which Perry has appeared only as an actor; popular films such as Star Trek, Alex Cross, and Gone Girl. To date, nine of Tyler Perry's twenty pictures as a producer, writer, or director have featured the character Madea, a plain-spoken and tough- loving elderly woman with a nurturing heart, a highly-acute antenna for the difference between right and wrong, and a penchant for involving herself in the troubles of other people. Madea, who's played in elaborate makeup and costuming by Perry himself, is based in equal measures upon the filmmaker's mother and aunt, and is partially inspired by the characterizations and performances by comic Eddie Murphy in the 2000 comedy The Nutty Professor II. Tyler Perry's comedies are remarkably accessible to filmgoing audiences. While the motion pictures of other filmmaking multi-taskers often appeal to an especially exclusive and rarefied demographic; Woody Allen springs to mind; Perry's movies are popular entertainment for anyone who loves to laugh. Unfortunately, Boo 2! is not among Perry's best pictures; or even among his best Madea pictures. While the laughs are there, especially for Perry's legions of fans and Madea aficionados, they're more sparse than usual, and less frequent. Both the filmmaker and the character he created seem to be going through the motions by rote, and without heart. Boo 2! is enjoyable enough. But audiences unfamiliar with Tyler Perry or Madea might find themselves wondering what all the fuss is about.

Rating: 41

6

Content: 41 , Size: 5619

Hellur! Tyler Perry's signature character has made her mark for so many years, teaching lessons in her own unique manner. These movies have come in all sorts of scenarios, many being close carbon copies of the predecessors that laid the foundation. This series continues to rope loyal fans into the theater though, never tiring of the gimmicks cooked up at Perry Studios. Tonight, the sequel to Madea's Halloween tale emerges, in hopes of mimicking the success it brought not long ago. What's the verdict? Robbie K, here asking you to read on to find out his opinions.

LIKES:

Familiarity: When it comes to Madea, you don't expect much deviation from the formula, a comforting factor indeed. Perry's writing doesn't try to be anything it's not, and that nets some respect in bringing the laughs that make so many laugh. And if you're a fan of this series, you'll have nothing to fear in regards to the comedy at hand (as evidenced by many people howling with laughter in my showing.)

Plenty of Madea: Some Madea movies don't do give the mad lady her adequate screen time, choosing instead to go for a more drama (soap opera like) plot. Boo 2 is more than happy to give you a Madea fix, with much of the 100-minute run time staying on our "protagonist." She leads much of the banter, and her insults are more than enough to keep things engaging alongside her older colleagues. So, for a movie promising Madea, this film delivers on this aspect as well.

Fast Pace: Another positive for Boo 2 is that the movie doesn't dawdle when it comes to getting to the laughs. A small, simplistic opening makes way to the comedy at hand, taking less than 20 minutes to get to the first bout of Madea running her mouth. Once that first joke flies, the movie continues at a steady pace and creating the effect of time flying (seriously had no idea an hour had passed). This leads to an entertaining environment that is simply fun on many levels, that's right no complicated thinking in this film.

Joe: By far the best part of the movie for me is Madea's brother Joe. While his sexually harsh jokes, lack of respect for others, and intense focus on drugs are not my main source of humor, this character has some of the best comedic moments of the movie. His timing is well- executed, and his lines are just harsh enough to offset the bickering this movie holds within. The piece de resistance though, is how well Perry delivers that gruff edge in his humor to maximize the punch of the line and keep the laughs fresh. I found myself laughing the most with his scenes and was glad to see more Joe in this film.

DISLIKES:

Unoriginal: Familiarity is fun and entertaining, but it is also lacking the original twist I like to see in the films. Every Madea film has a slight twist to it, but this film is too much a copy of the first Halloween movie that the tactics are fairly stale. Had it not been for

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

the comedic timing at some parts of the movie, the bantering would have gotten much staler as the old folks complained about the same things consistently. This dislike also goes to the fact that Madea's jokes are losing favor with me, especially when they drop the morals for incoherent babbling and arguing.

The College Kids: If you read my last Madea review, you know the college kids didn't impress me. Sadly, this movie managed to make me loathe these characters even more. Rather than giving the younger characters some admirable qualities, outside of superficial looks, Perry crafted them to be the same, shallow, annoying selves they were in the past, only much worse. The fraternity brother are even hornier, stupid meatheads with little contribution to the movie. Leah (Lexy Panterra) is reduced to a squabbling airhead, who does little, but flash off her own body with overacted gestures and a skin-tight leopard shirt. Yet, the worst character goes to Tiffany (Diamond White) the arrogant brat who supposedly learned her lesson last time. After all the punishing blows, the hotheaded teen hasn't learned a thing and has fallen back into the same annoying qualities I despised in the first film. What's even more pathetic, is that they don't use her selfishness very well to drive a moral filled plot, but just as a tool for more jokes. Sadly, this movie doesn't give the satisfying punch that its predecessor accomplished.

No story: Boo 2's other major dislike for me is that lack of a story.

It's true, the movie runs at a quick pace and is entertaining, but the trailers have tricked you into thinking there is a story. This particular Madea story is the lamest story of the bunch, with only a hair thin plot to ground the comedy too. Past this skeletal frame, the movie is only about cramming the most jokes into the run time, which also took away from the Madea formula.

The VERDICT:

Boo 2 is a sequel that accomplishes the goal of making you laugh with the same familiar tactics Perry has capitalized on for the last decade. It's simple fun, fast paced humor will keep fans howling in delight, while also welcoming a new age in with its simplicity. Yet, I found this movie to be the weakest of the installments, particularly due to the unbalanced characters and lack of story to guide the mischief better. Safe to say this movie is meant for home viewing pleasure where you can enjoy the banter and insults with better snacks and bathroom privileges.

My scores:

Comedy/Horror: 7.0 Movie Overall: 5.0

Rating: 42

6

Content: 42 , Size: 401

While the first. Madea boo offered a decent amount of laughs but I found the sequel to be somewhat lacking, while the movie features the return of fan favorites Madea, Joe, bam and Hattie Mae but it Felton like the similar tone of th first despite being the tenth Madea film. Brian's ex wife Deborah makes a return appearance since diary of a mad

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

black woman, but played by a different actress.

Rating: 43

2

Content: 43 , Size: 636

I would have loved it if the prank was for real. How Madea would real act when scared for real.

What i didn't like : 1. Joe is too much and is no longer funny.

The teenager with her friend, were very boring.

The whole movie was disappointing.

The turn around of the ex wife was very not genuine. I would have loved to have seen more drama on that and also when Perry heard that his ex allowed the daughter to go for a party, i have loved Tyler not to be part of the prank and also Tyler not to let the daughter go easy. Bottom line drama was not there and the bit that was there was not interesting.

Rating: 44

1

Content: 44 , Size: 832

OK, when are people who think Madea is funny going to wake up and see this is just a bad story, writing, directing and acting all in one movie. I would have preferred to watch 10 hours straight of PBS, just so I can get back whatever brain cells were sucked out while having to sit through this debacle. It was not funny!! The actors were one dimensional. The jokes were either sexist or racist. The plot was stupid. Take my advice, stay away from Perry's movies. He has become one of the bloated, bad directors that Hollywood should be ashamed of and they should be ashamed for ever making these types of movies. With so many good choices in steaming, cable and other movies it is hard to believe people would go to this heap of a movie. By the way, the only reason we went is we got free passes and it was still a rip off!!

Rating: 45

3

Content: 45 , Size: 314

Concur with other reviewers! Definitely not worth paying full price for. If it wasn't Tyler Perry, I would believe it was just a money grab?? Oddly, my family and many of the audience laughed a lot but not his best work and not half as funny as original. Even Hattie couldn't save this one, sniff sniff

Rating: 46

2

Content: 46 , Size: 400

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

This was not his best, even earlier ones, Father's straying to profanity and vulgar, adults left early and families with kids met us in the lobby. Tone it down and balance the racial references. Disappointed at this one. Maby this was the one too many with same line, two new characters added did not fit. Fresh dialog and tone down Father. Summary, We will still support he and his characters.

Rating: 47

5

Content: 47 , Size: 2056

So as far as sequels go, this is a very typical one. I went to see Boo 2 because though Tyler Perry movies are not really my thing, I actually enjoined the first Boo, so I took the chance that I would enjoy the second one.

I totally did, too. It's not as good as the original. As much as I found the original funny, it also had an attempt to show family values in it that was not lost on me. This time around their attempt (If there was one cause I did not see it) was literally taken out to make more room for laughs. In a lot of ways it made the film like the second episode of one of Perry's shows (Which I like more than his movies), as it seems nobody learned the lesson from the first Madea Halloween.

Case in point, like the original, Boo 2 is about Joe trying to discipline his entitled daughter, Tiffany. Once again she defies her overbearing father's wishes in order to go to a party at midnight in the woods at a camp where a bunch of people got murdered. Now I understand the natural urge for a teenager not to want to listen to her dad, but when your aunt is someone like Madea, you would think you would think twice about this woman coming to track you down, especially after what happen in the last movie.

Like the last film, Boo 2 focuses on Madea and her friends running into terror and danger while trying to get to Tiffany. The film likes to Parody current themes in horror like with influences of Korean horror and it also pokes a nod to old school Horror with the film taking place at a camp and the underage teens being hunted by a man with a mask and a chainsaw.

Overall, I much prefer the more light hearted Tyler Perry movies. Sometimes his stuff can be too over dramatic for me, but I seem to like it when he goes for straight up Sitcom style on us and that's Boo 2!

It's crazy and filled with laughs and no matter where it fails compare to the first one, we are there to laugh and that's what makes this sequel enjoyable.

<http://cinemagardens.com/?p=1756>

Rating: 48

1

Content: 48 , Size: 1144

Firstest of all DA haters can just get shook off. #shakeemoff

Tyler Perry is

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

both DA funniest man and woman simultaneously in dis
film y'all.

I was luffing so hard i almost choked on mu popcorn yo but
also dis
movie is also Hakka scurry yo, Dem jump scares had me like "oh snap"
but Madea handled DAT stuff, yo go girl and den also you give it up to
DA jay man in the sky #blessesed

i hope they make 8 mo sequels because dis
was tight.

Mr.Perry this is the fan base you appeal to, At very least this is what
you imagine the mindset of your audience to be.

Your films are modern day
minstrel shows and as Madea you personify
every negative stereotype that exists in black culture. Nothing about
what you do or say is even remotely funny.

I wonder on occasion if through
the piles of cash and the turbid veil
of Hollywood, If you take the time to look at yourself in the mirror
before you inevitably shuck and jive your way through another film.

Rating: 49

3

Content: 49 , Size: 3596

Let me just say that for the record, I'm not a Madea fan, I am just a
casual moviegoer. But that doesn't mean I can't get enjoyment out of
these movies.

Last year, I saw Boo! A Madea Halloween. I thought it was okay.
Sure,
some of the comedy scenes dragged on and on and there were some stupid
moments, but I overall thought it was an alright movie. I thought it
was way better than the other comedy I saw that year, Why Him.

But one year
later, we get this movie. Hoo boy.

Now, when I heard that they were making
ANOTHER Madea Halloween movie
one year after they already did one, I thought to myself, "Why? Didn't
they just do one?" But then, I was like, "Whatever. Maybe something new
is in store."

When I heard the plot of this movie, I thought it sounded
like the
laziest sequel ever.

When I saw the movie, I was right.

I did not
enjoy this film. The plot was the SAME EXACT THING as the
last film. (Spoiler alert) That teenage girl goes to yet ANOTHER party
with those frat guys, somehow not learning her lesson from last time,
and surprise surprise, something supernatural happens. How lazy and
uninspired can you get? Oh, and if you weren't there for the first
Halloween movie, don't worry. The characters will be happy to mention
it constantly. And just like the last film, some scenes with Madea and
her friends talking drag. But it's shorter this time around. That's
good. Some parts of this movie were stale, like a lot of scenes
featured the same thing happening: Madea and the gang are in their car
and something jumps out at them and scares them. Rinse and repeat. A

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

lot of the characters got really annoying, especially Madea's brother, Joe, who I swear, always had something to say whenever a sentence was uttered. Further contributing to the film's laziness, the moral (if you will) from Boo 1 was the same, but it was with the mom instead of the dad. It wasn't really built up like last time, it was just rushed. And speaking of the parents, you'd think that after the father learned his lesson in the predecessor, that he'd be getting back together with his ex wife or something. But nope. He's still divorced, and his ex wife hooked up with another bald dude. Oh, and do you wanna know the twist in this movie? Well, get this... The father was behind all the ghosts and demons scaring away the kids. Yep. Just like last time where the father had involvement with the fake arrest thing. Pitiful. Absolutely pitiful. And oh yeah, the film ends on somewhat of a cliffhanger, where (spoiler alert) it turns out that one of the creatures that haunted the kids was actually real. Oh, please don't do a Boo 3. I hope this was only a joke.

But through all the bad things this film had to offer, there were some

things that I liked. A diamond in the rough, if you will. But it's more like a diamond in the litter box. I liked the return of Yousef Ereka. He was funny in the last one and was quite funny in this one. Also, that scene where Madea is in the police station and sees herself on a "Wanted" poster was pretty funny. (How the cops don't recognize her is beyond me.) But that scene seemed to drag, as well. But those things could not save the movie.

Overall, this was a disappointment. It had little effort thrown into it and was basically a retread of the first Madea Halloween movie. I do not recommend it... Unless you're a hardcore Madea fan and need to see everything that this character is in.

Rating: 50

10

Content: 50 , Size: 757

(sent from my Iphone3) Good day Madea fans! I am writing this review from my seat in the theater, having just watched B002 3 times. Let me say this, this movie is a keeper! Don't let those snoozy reviews throw you off! You have to see this movie! From the opening credits to the last sound, this movie will keep you on edge. That Madea cat is something else and I have to say, my B002 Tshirt, just ordered from Amazon.com, is inbound as of yesterday! OK, back to the movie. B002 will keep you "howling" throughout, and if you are looking to be tricked? Have no "fear" as this movie is a treat! Get your popcorn, treat it with some hot saux, and sit back and relax. You will not be disappointed. B002 is not a "Boo Hoo."

Rating: 51

5

Content: 51 , Size: 1243

. . . and not in any good way. It's as if Harvey Weinstein, Bill Cosby, and O.J. Simpson have gotten together to remake THE HUMAN CENTIPEDE. Writer/Director/Boom Operator Tyler Perry peppers BOO 2 with the N-Word as he mocks Transgendered Folks, Christians, Wiccans, and Family Values. Maybe his Simmons Family and their three generations of prostitutes is enough of a lame joke to carry ONE film, but certainly not 43. A typical sample gag from BOO 2 is Pops Brian Simmons encouraging his slutty daughter Tiffany--who's dressed so she'd fit right in on the cover of about half of Mr. Perry's 1980s VHS tape Porno Collection--to dance; the Peeing Dog at a Fire Hydrant; The Sprinkler; and The Toilet Seat. Mr. Perry needs to realize that for every Human Action, Nature requires an Equal and Opposite Reaction. The Blue-Man Pict and Green Leprechaun Races offered THEIR versions of BOO 2 just before Humanity was compelled to eradicate them. (When's the last time that a Blue Dude or a Green Witch plopped down next to YOU at the theater? Think about it.) BOO 2 very well could become the provocation that brings a similar Fate Down Upon Perry's People!

Rating: 52

1

Content: 52 , Size: 1791

The 3D special effects for this movie were fantastic. The screenplay was so bad that it became a comedy, probably better than some comedies I have seen recently. Literally the audience was laughing out loud. All of the trite lines were there. But more disturbing was the not so cloaked attempt by Hollywood to get their message across:
1. The Democratic President is a hero. 2. His Secretary of State, a USA isolationist who wants to destroy American's enemies before they destroy us, is the bad guy. At least Ed Harris didn't try to look like Trump. 3. A self-driving car was the escape vehicle. 4. Global climate change is real and so bad (2019) that it could destroy the world. 5. The strong blond sexy female Secret Service agent could (and does) out do any man. Don't mess with her, she will shoot you dead. 6. Males need to bond more. They need to be soft and caring and their early boyhood competitiveness can destroy sibling relationships.. 7. An Iranian (by the flag on his uniform) is one of the villains, but in the end the Arabs of Dubai are saved. 8. A Mexican is the one who ultimately saves the overly masculine protagonist and the strong German female partner (Ach Du Lieber). The Mexican savior literally points to the flag on this sleeve at the end of the movie. 9. A precious precocious little girl looks forward to saving the future of the planet.
Not that I disagree with any of these principles necessarily but goodness. I haven't seen a propaganda movie like this in a LONG time.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Based on the trailers, it obviously is supposed to appeal to males... so get them in the seats and let the sermons begin. Hollywood... please. All that money should have been given to the starving children around the world. Imagine how far it would go!

Rating: 53

8

Content: 53 , Size: 519

Wow, the critics went to town on this film didn't they.

Although this film wasn't close to perfect, it doesn't deserve such a low score.

My main negative critique was that the writing/screenplay was a little sloppy, although still very entertaining.

But either than that, the performances were decent, the cinematography/sfx well done and the directing was good.

An enjoyable film that I would see again maybe one more time, but certainly not deserving of such a low score.

Rating: 54

7

Content: 54 , Size: 656

This is an action-packed movie that will entertain you; and you will feel pretty okay about what you've just witnessed.

Very nice special effects. The storms were nicely done. CGI was convincing.

Why I think this works better than other "Natural Disaster" films is because they did not revolve the plot around the storms...the storms were just the vehicle of destruction used. It's more like a Live Free Or Die Hard conspiracy, but instead of hi-jacking the IoT, they are hi-jacking weather control satellites.

Good CGI, a fun movie.

7/10

*Had Bruce Willis been in it... would have made it an 8.5

Rating: 55

7

Content: 55 , Size: 1744

In Geostorm, Earth is beset by natural disasters. In facing adversity, mankind developed a satellite station to prevent these catastrophes. While people overcame this problem, another conflict arises when it becomes opportune to use the technology as a weapon for sole global domination.

The setting in which the story takes place, you can say, parallels our own at the present in which we are experiencing technological advancements which perks we use to solve our crises but also create further dilemma as countries individually vie to be the world superpower.

Going to see the movie, I wasn't expecting much for it

because it

seemed like a so-so movie that's probably been done before only re-released with a semi different plot; under a different title. But I was surprised by how entertaining it is. There's the timeliness of its subject, there's definitely humor (which is funny but I thought they somehow overdid with some of the dialogue) but this one has also dramatic scenes that would touch you. The pathos really got me emotionally involved with what the characters are experiencing. This aspect I really enjoyed.

The downside, I can still say that it seems a lot of it's contents were borrowed from/ inspired by previous natural disaster/sci-fi flicks such as Day After Tomorrow (look at one of its posters for instance), Armageddon, and Gravity to name a few. This might be a turnoff for moviegoers who are expecting originality and it will most likely be so but for me, I got over it and had myself a good time in the cinema. It is definitely not the best movie this year or ever but its up there with the good, entertaining ones I really enjoyed watching this year.

Rating: 56

10

Content: 56 , Size: 1490

When the network of satellites designed to control the global climate start to attack Earth, it's a race against the clock to uncover the real threat before a worldwide geostorm wipes out everything and everyone. Geostorm is one of those films that i didn't expect to go see on the Big Screen or even like in general. Unlike past disaster films this one is actually more grounded and more realistic in its own way and it's not some volcano or an earthquake it's actually humans that pull the strings here. The acting is also impressive by everyone from Gerard Butler to Abbie Cornish to Andy Garcia and beyond. The cgi are top notch with a lot of impressive and beautiful shots of cities falling down or entire buildings and airplanes. It also goes a bit dramatic during the end and i gotta say it does touch you on those feelings, there's also comedy of course and although not every joke hits some of them are actually pretty great and even when it's slow a bit it picks right after especially the last 30 to 35 minutes are action packed, special effects nerdgasm. Thanks to an all star talented cast, impressive cgi and some heartfelt moments Geostorm is an action packed popcorn flick that some people will love and some others won't; it depends on your own personal taste and if you like this kind of movies in general but if you enjoyed films such as 2012, Armageddon, Volcano, San Andreas and Dante's Peak you won't be disappointed.

Rating: 57

1

Content: 57 , Size: 1052

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

I don't know who keeps asking movies about natural disasters, but Independence Day: Resurgence, 2012, San Andreas, among others, proved that it's not a very good idea. But as long as the majority likes it, who am I to judge?

OK, let's begin. Gerard Butler plays a man who saves our planet from natural problems, storms, cold winters, with the help of a space station, zZzZzZzZzZz.

Geostorm is so full of CGI, that at one point you start to get headaches and you'll never understand what's behind the desire of destroying the planet. It has something to do with the White House, I didn't catch the idea because I felt asleep for a short period of time.

If you want a film full of disasters that are also eye-candy, Geostorm is not the best idea. The movie is the same as other disaster flicks, nothing new. I believe the writer wrote the script in 2-3 days.

If you want something mindless, with a total waste of talent, full of clichés and loud sounds, Geostorm is the perfect choice.

Rating: 58

8

Content: 58 , Size: 583

I noted a few 'rubbish' reviews, they seem to have been watching some other movie. This has a pretty good premise (with actually possible science), and some excellent action and effects. I felt I got my ticket's worth, no question.

I would have rated it higher but there is a bit of cheesy voice-over at the end and some slightly clichéd dialogue I wasn't in love with. still, those are minor flaws, and for somebody wanting a good weekend popcorn action movie, you will not be disappointed. plus Butler has a few great lines you will really enjoy.

Rating: 59

8

Content: 59 , Size: 639

I was pleasantly surprised how good this movie really is. I tend to like disaster movies so I may have given it extra stars than some. I gave it a strong 8 for the story line and the special effects. At times there were cheesy scenes but that is just the nature of the beast. Hollywood does it's best making these style movies as real as possible. Looking back at Volcano and Dante's Peak even those were done well for their time. It was nice to see Ed Harris and Andy Garcia in a movie too, seems like these guys take big breaks between movies. So without going on and on I recommend this movie for disaster buffs like myself.

Rating: 60

1

Content: 60 , Size: 467

I found this film to be very sleep worthy, in fact I had to check the plot afterwards as I kept dozing off. Very cheesy American human interest story about the relationship between two brothers was its central theme. The sci-fi was badly thought out and made Gerry Anderson look like an expert. The highlight for me was when the baddie was revealed to be a disciple of Trump. I left the cinema muttering 'we should have invested more in renewable energy'.

Rating: 61

2

Content: 61 , Size: 575

I was really looking forward to see this movie after I saw trailer for it. Oh, how I was wrong. I can't remember when have I seen such a bad movie in every aspect of it. Stupid dialogues, bad acting, really shallow plot... And of course, how can we bypass politics from real life... In movie, several countries participate in making the technology for saving Earth, but no Russians, they are bad, they don't want to save planet where they live... Really... Puke... At least I've collected a lots of points on my Cinema bonus card, so I watched it for free...

Rating: 62

2

Content: 62 , Size: 2461

When the movie ended, the 8 year old behind me said, "Thats the end? Mom, they didn't show the Geostorm!" and I kid you not, he started to cry.

I can totally relate. We came to see destruction, that kid and I! To see a disaster film! But, frankly, the only disaster here is the script.

First of all, the whole first 45 minutes could have been skipped. Frankly, no one cares about Gerald Butler and his relationship with his brother. (That whole plot line plays out like a lack- luster tele-novela.) And Jim Sturgess is so bad, the less we see of him actually talking the better. (I spent the whole movie thinking how much better it would have been if Sturgess's role had been played by Zazie Beetz. Zazie Beetz as the sister in the white house. Zazie Beetz having an affair with Secret Service agent Abbie Cornish... Now that would have been interesting...)

This is how they SHOULD have done it: Start the movie with the Geostorm clock. Right off the bat: count down to destruction! Weather going crazy! Mayhem!

Gerry Butler arrives to fix it. A German lady helps but everything starts to blow up. Meanwhile, Zazie and Abbie are racing around with the president shooting bad guys!

65% of the planet is destroyed! (For real! Even the dog!) But our heroes still pull it off, even though Ed Harris turns out to be the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

really wicked bad guy. (Isn't it ALWAYS Ed Harris?)

But surprise! The traitor on the space station is not the French guy!

It's the skinny English guy who needs a shower! Gerry finally gets to beat someone up. (But it does look like he's beating up a 14 year old.

Its kind of creepy, really.)

After killing the teen-aged brit and stopping the countdown at 1, Gerry

and the German scientists are saved by a Space Mexican. (Literally the only good part of the movie is the Space Mexican.)

At no moment do we hear anything about Gerry's feelings. He is

childless, so we are spared the horrible acting of the daughter. There is no whooshing, clunking or explosion sounds in the space scenes

BECAUSE IT IS A VACUUM. There are some actual futuristic cars to go with all of the space shuttles and the fancy smart phones. Gerald

Butler talks like a normal person and not guy in a bar in South Boston.

(They could have named the movie "Southies in Space"!) Most

importantly: THERE IS AN ACTUAL GEOSTORM!

No Geostorm. No movie. For real.

Rating: 63

2

Content: 63 , Size: 868

This was bad.... really bad! I am a big disaster movie fan and can sit through most things, but wow this was really boring.. the characters

are shallow, predictable and the chemistry between them stilted and forced.

The special effects were OK, but you just didn't get any sense of the

fear because there was no character that developed enough for you to

fear for them.

I think a better movie would have been Gerard Butler developing the

satellite system and saving the world from Global Warming in the first

place.. at least that may have been believable.

I watched Geo Disaster on Syfy the other day and at the time was

thinking that it would be a poor mans Geostorm.. but seriously it turned out to be the better of the two films.. that should tell you just how dreadful this film was. It only gets 2 because the special effects were OK.

Rating: 64

1

Content: 64 , Size: 700

THERE IS NO GEOSTORM! Only a family drama and bad acting, some nice CGI effects about tornados at Asia, tsunami on Dubai (shit), cool climate changes at Rio de Janeiro (who are those people there? they don't look Brazilians), a lovely drama about a couple working at government, the conspiracy government that is not fault of the great president of that great united states of America (terrorists are always from other countries).

Tell me why the guy is so invincible? He goes to space, explodes

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

a big station, and can survive everything! But he is a bad father to his daughter... oh no! If someone liked this movie and gave it some good 10 score, of course he was paid for it! No way!

Rating: 65

2

Content: 65 , Size: 1405

I went to see Geostorm because it was the only movie playing on a night where I really wanted to go to the 4D-cinema. Since it was a disaster movie I figured it would go well with the big screen and the 4D-effects.

Right from start I felt that something was off. The dialogue and over all atmosphere felt tacky and the acting didn't seem genuine. This was only the beginning though.

Geostorm is filled with canned dialogue and clichés that will make you cringe. Most of the actors under perform and there's no real chemistry between the main actors.

During the whole movie you feel like you're watching a movie that you've already seen and the tropes used are so in-your-face that you almost feel provoked.

I was thinking about leaving several times during the movie but since I was with friends I decided to stay. During the climax of the movie several people in the audience were loudly mocking the movie and laughing at the absurdity of it all.

Everything about Geostorm was a disaster. It was very predictable and preachy and the director actually made you feel dumb throughout most of the movie. The only OK thing was the CGI but even that felt re-used and tired.

Nobody should watch this movie. It's utterly bad and should be avoided at any cost. I don't even want to think about how much money was spent on this garbage

Rating: 66

1

Content: 66 , Size: 449

Hollywood is officially DEAD! They have run out of ideas and keep recycling the same trash over and over all the while shoving their far-left liberal politics down the throats of a fed-up public whose beginning to wake up. This sorry piece of CGI crap with a terrible script and actors who seemed like they phoned their performances in is what Hollywood calls entertainment to the masses nowadays. Don't waste your money or time on this turkey.

Rating: 67

8

Content: 67 , Size: 594

Probably because of the weak marketing campaign, I didn't hear much of Geostorm, and I watched it last night with low expectation.

And Woow!!! I did not expect to see it coming. It was so Good!! The Weather technology used in this movie are very detailed. I love how Geostorm makes this sci-fi movie into a thrill mystery. I love to see the chemistry between Jim Sturgess and Abbie Cornish. The only lacking here is the development between Jim Sturgess and Gerard Butler character.

While waiting for the big movie at the end of the year, Geostorm is definitely must watch.

Rating: 68

9

Content: 68 , Size: 447

I went for this movie since my wife likes watching movies with this theme. The Day after tomorrow or Apocalypse themed movies where nature is destroying everything. This movie surprisingly had more to offer. It has a fantastic suspenseful plot. The two main protagonists Gerard Butler and Jim Strugess are brothers. They have fantastic chemistry and the story unfolds brilliantly. The special effects are awe-inspiring. A great effort. Loved it.

Rating: 69

6

Content: 69 , Size: 1198

Plot Spoiler review? Extreme weather is killing the planet. Satellites around the globe are equipped to control the weather by shooting little pellets. It is controlled by a space station with the system designed by Jake Lawson (Gerald Butler). When the space station malfunctions, causing sharknados or something, only Gerald Butler pretending to be Mel Gibson can save the world...with the help from his brother (Jim Sturgess) who he must reconnect with to make a good personal story. It is quickly discovered it is sabotage and there is a mystery as to who would do this...unless you have ever seen a Scooby-doo episode, then you have it figured out. Are you smarter than a fifth grader? The science aspect of science fiction lacked explanation as to how they were able to control air pressure with pellets or the gravity maker which nearly every space film has, but in reality is not feasible any time soon...which is why NASA isn't working on one. The science fiction is more fiction than science. The mystery aspect wasn't really a mystery so we are left with a passable thriller with some light moments, mostly provided by Adepero Oduye.

Guide: No swearing, sex or nudity.

Rating: 70

3

Content: 70 , Size: 251

Geostorm

fixating on the inner politics i.e. behind the stage was a wise choice

rather than wasting the time with the vfx explosion which still doesn't mean that it's a promising movie as it contains lots of flaws and a poor writer.

Rating: 71

2

Content: 71 , Size: 2217

This movie is one of those lame Sci-Fi movies with one difference. Good actors and good CGI. But what the hell in the world was that script?! I don't know any movie that caught me literally sleeping in cinema.

Anyways, script was so cliché; that there was nothing unexpected there.

And this is story not about Armageddon or anything similar, this is a story of 2 brothers, who fight with each other and 'good'; and ofc 'bad';

guys. There is also so much nonsense, people are using gasoline cars, but they are able to deploy millions of satellites and make net over whole damn earth.

Rockets are like deployed every day, multiple times, by not new tech,

but current rocket system, which is unbelievable stupid.

He is sitting in a rocket the same way like when you would go to supermarket to buy groceries, just turn on and fly to the space.

And let's forget all these things, but the thing that HE BUILT THE NET is most amazing stupidity in the movie.

There is one good, and one bad guy. Why people cannot be good and bad

at same time in this kind of cliché movies. The 'bad'; guy is destroying

world intentionally. This can be compared to a guy who tries to open a packaged food can with a nuclear bomb. This is nothing.

I ignored even nonsense about instant weather changes, where people are burning and out of sudden, just 2 meters away there is normal

temperature and there is NO WIND. Whoever cooked the soup know that soup starts moving in all directions on temperature change, similar goes with the air. but, author of this script doesn't understand that.

With this budget he SHOULD KNOW that almost everyone knows the basics of physics. But let's forget even this.

The thing that during the movie you figure out the resolution of

conversation after 10-30 seconds, but conversation lasts for another 10 minutes. This made me so bored that I couldn't watch it. This killed, destroyed and vanished all my will to watch movie.

Terrible, very very stereotypical American, physics taken from some other universe and truly awful. Popcorns in cinema was best

entertainment, and games on my phone.

Rating: 72

1

Content: 72 , Size: 1722

WARNING - CONTAINS PROGRESSIVE PROPAGANDA AND OTHER SPOILERS

I like disaster movies. I like good CGI when it serves a purpose. I like good acting and memorable characters. What I don't like is Leftist, Liberal Propaganda shoved in my face as not only as a plot element, but the entire movie script as well! I thought that this was supposed to be an entertaining Sci-Fi Disaster Flick. Here are the main points for you to consider: 1.) CAGW is not only real, but it will happen TOMORROW; 2.) Only Democrat Presidents are Good; 3.) Technology is so flawed, that any idiot can take it over for nefarious purposes; 4.) The World can Unite under the United Nations to produce Great Feats of Global Engineering; and 5.) CGI can bail out a Horrible Film. Frankly, I am getting so tired of Political Viewpoints infecting Sci-Fi and Action Films. If you want to do Political Propaganda Films, please make them International Thrillers or Dramas or something other than Blatantly Obvious, In Your Face, Left Wing Political statements. And if you want to do a Climate related Disaster Film, don't repeat the already used and absurd "Instant Mr. Freeze" effect that can't be performed without dumping a cryogenic fluid on someone or somehow causing an airplane to fall out of the sky by instantly freezing the aircraft without suddenly encasing it in a solid block of ice! Been there, Done that already. Now, if you want to use a form of EMP attack, at least it would be believable. Suffice it to say, that like many recent feature films that have been ruined by inserting political garbage as a major plot element, Geostorm should be avoided at all costs, unless you are a die hard Al Gore lunatic!

Rating: 73

7

Content: 73 , Size: 377

Geostorm is pretty much as good as a disaster film can get. The SFX & VFX are phenomenal, the acting is good, the story line is a bit silly, but most disaster movie plots are.

Geostorm isn't as good as Into The Storm, but is better than San Andreas.

This is a movie for the big screen, if you like disaster films then you should go and see Geostorm.

Rating: 74

9

Content: 74 , Size: 787

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

We've all seen such movies where mankind is facing certain destruction. Countless movie titles and countless resembling points. Seems all the available ideas have been taken and put to use, but it doesn't mean that a movie cannot be intriguing or thrilling.

Geostorm has the all-knows scenario - series of events strike the Earth, lots of people die and bunch of heroes try their best to save them all.

But the story and action are very well made. It's dramatic, suspenseful, sometimes funny with some nice touches. The effects are good, well not like Avatar or The Avengers, but still realistic. I'd even say that the acting is very good.

Assets and flows, leave them behind, I find the movie really cool and I don't regret watching it.

Rating: 75

9

Content: 75 , Size: 701

This movie surprised the hell out of me and so did the rest of the audience(there was genuine applause at the end of the movie). Before watching I'd read some negative reviews, thankfully I ignored them and decided to watch it. The entire movie is directed well, despite the the difficult theme and message it delivers. I must say if it weren't for the beautiful flow to the movie and some good performances from the actors this would've flopped. I don't want to give you any hints which could be a spoiler alert, but there are two very important messages it delivers: 1) Do not mess with nature. 2) Regardless of race, religion, color etc, the planet and also the cosmos is one!

Rating: 76

10

Content: 76 , Size: 363

Critics are not fair once again. This movie was very good, I loved it. Gerard Butler nailed it and so did the men and women on his team. I was on the edge of my seat throughout the movie. There were some funny lines that the audience enjoyed too. There was drama, sadness, action. I will be seeing this one again. The story lines all blended together very well.

Rating: 77

4

Content: 77 , Size: 749

When you watch the trailer of "Geostorm";, you can easily get excited by the stunning VFX and ultra catastrophic incidents (Mega Tsunami, etc.). However, after watching the full movie, you realize that they have packed the trailer with all the action scenes, so expect nothing new at the theater. Unlike "2012";, this movie has a far less reasonable plot

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

or intense scenes, the science behind it is also kind of a joke compared to similar titles. Unfortunately, it is one of those consumer movies where the protagonist arguably saves the world at the last second of a countdown. The movie ISN'T BAD though, it has a good package of this and that, it just doesn't meet the fan high expectations following its propaganda.

Rating: 78

5

Content: 78 , Size: 998

I had been waiting for this movie since the first trailer I saw early in the year. I have to be honest in that I walked out before the end as I had seen it (a similar ending) 1000 times before in other movies. And I didn't care enough about the story or characters to stick around. The ending is just ridiculous in the same mold as Gravity and Passengers. I like Sci-Fi as much as anyone but not when it gets too impossible to even kind of believe it then I can't take it. I have to have some thread of reality to cling to.****Spoiler Alert**** At the end when the space station is disintegrating and millions of little parts are blasting all over the vicinity the 2 space walkers are just bouncing along hard into sharp type objects and somehow avoiding said millions of pieces of shrapnel any one of which would have ended their joyous space waltz forever.....couldn't take.....oh well....."He made a promise" gimme a break! other spfx were well done....not the end

Rating: 79

6

Content: 79 , Size: 1217

The idea behind this movie is good, but the realization is awful.

The movie failed because of the director, who appears to be pretty bad at being a director. He tried to create a good science fiction but ended up creating something that reminded me of the second part of Independence Day (which was an awful science fiction). Another thing that ruined this movie was the poorly written script, which was also written by this incompetent director.

However there are a few things that make this movie not that bad. They tried to get rid of the "The USA saves the world" cliché (they failed, but hey - at least they tried). The idea behind the movie was good and original. But as I already said the director and the bad acting of the actors (which is also the director's fault) ruined it.

This movie had the potential of becoming a great science fiction, such as Interstellar and The Martian but only if it was directed by a more talented person. Still I give this movie 6 out of 10, simply because the idea was original and managed to unite fiction and catastrophe into one. Too bad they failed to find a decent director, who will be able to

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

make this idea into a masterpiece.

Rating: 80

10

Content: 80 , Size: 232

Best movie ever...

Brilliant 3D & 4D work....

Worth Watching a nice movie after long time...

The 3 D & 4 D effects are mind blowing.

I would strongly recommend every one to watch this movie...

Rating: 81

7

Content: 81 , Size: 836

After reading the reviews nearly passed on Geostorm but having enjoyed a few movies critics have panned and vice versa decided to brave the storm (sorry) and risk it. Despite some clunky script at times & stereotyping I settled down to a film i found not so much a disaster movie but more a race against time mystery/thriller. And in that light I quite enjoyed it.

The film is saved by some strong female characters (including Gerard's daughter who manages to convincingly resemble my own 12 year old - a mixture of plain speaking childhood vulnerability and strong common sense) plus a concept thats half believable, if hugely depressing (in light of recent weather disasters). The special effects are pretty good. Perhaps we r spoiled and have seen too many Days after Tomorrow and 2012s to appreciate them anymore.

Rating: 82

7

Content: 82 , Size: 1005

Just to get it out of the way the science on Geostorm is... not good. It reminds me of The Core or Armageddon. You just have to accept it and move on, I feel it unjust to judge the movie on something that they obviously put little emphasis on.

The basic idea is that is that thanks to global warming we needed a net of weather control satellites (literal a net, as in they are connected in space) to keep weather from being insanely bad. They start going bad and doing stuff like freezing an Afgan village, or cooking part of a city like a microwave. Two brothers try and find out what is going on a fix it. One goes to orbit the other stays on earth. It had two threads and many characters and used them well. It's a spy thriller with a large dose of a natural disaster movie thrown in. I could have done without the environmental message but it did not really get in the way, also the science was so ridicules that you could not really take it seriously.

www.JoshuaLawrencePike.com

Rating: 83

7

Content: 83 , Size: 374

Predictable, but my mom likes this movie as she shed tears. I don't know why Max hates Jake so. Better if Max & Jake didn't have any issue before Jake was fired, then they're off over 5 years, until Dutch Boy went rogue. And Max, if it is Jim Sturgess's style, why is so rushy since beginning, he should have been a calm person, with neat haircut.

Rating: 84

6

Content: 84 , Size: 2976

Poorly Written Poorly Executed Poorly Acted Too many plot lines Very predictable

I went to see this film at the cinema with some friends to celebrate the end of a term, and I found it shocking that the ADS were more enjoyable than the film. Of course, my friends and I talked through the ads, making fun of them, and that's what made them enjoyable. We also talked through the actual FILM, but we found that there was too much to talk about, because it was so boring, and we didn't want to disturb the audience, so we kept our traps shut. I regret that choice.

How the hell can all of these disaster movies be so bad; I mean there's Godzilla, San Andreas and this train wreck. The story is so bad, though it is an interesting idea; but we had the villain who was behind the whole scheme have no depth put into him so we, the audience can understand his motivations, and maybe even sympathize with him. But, no, we just have this character lazily thrown into the story at the last minute to create a form of a movie. His motivations hardly make sense, as well; I mean, he decides to blow everything up, including himself, so he can be President!??? Good plan, I hear you muttering, but it gets even better when the character (I'd rather not say) actually tells the "bland as tofu" heroes how to stop the 'geostorm' from happening!!! How the hell can I NOT complain about the writing, when it is THIS bad!?!?

My friend, who sat next to me, and I pretty much predicted what's going to happen as the story continued; "Oh, he's gonna get killed", "Oh, that guy's gonna escape". It even got so bad that when the villain was INTRODUCED, we guessed that he was the guy behind the 'geostorm' crap. And the cliché's! So many cliché's! They even used "the guy saves the day when the countdown reaches '1' cliché". Who uses that any more? Even "Alien" tricked the audience into believing they were doing that, and how did they trick the audience? Because that story can't be predicted

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

like this one!!

The acting of some people are horrendous; and there's one actress I have to mention because I haven't seen anything LIKE it. Telitha Eliana Bateman, is only like 11, right, so I can't bully her too much, but Jesus, who the hell cast her into this film AND make her narrate it? I seriously hope they got sacked, along with Telitha.

However, there is one tiny part I liked about the film, which doesn't even matter to be honest, and that is the CG, because it looks pretty nice. But as another reviewer, also on this movie, said: "They spent 50 million on the special effects budget, but only 10 dollars on the screenplay budget."

In Conclusion, this film is a boring mess that tries to be more than it bargains for and so just makes it ANOTHER Disastrous Disaster Movie

6/10

Rating: 85

10

Content: 85 , Size: 1498

Even before watching it, you already pretty much know what you're getting from this movie: scenes of big destruction & peril, cities crumbling, buildings toppling, and people running for their lives, etc. If that sounds fun, you will enjoy this movie. If you like other disaster movies like 2012, San Andreas, Day After Tomorrow, etc., you'll probably like this one. If you wanna be a snob and complain about writing or dialogue or whatever... well, what did you ever expect from a movie like this anyway? Just sit back and enjoy the disasters and explosions and have fun and you'll have a good time.

It's a movie that does what it sets out to do, so it gets a 10/10 from me.

Interestingly though, there's also a space station disaster subplot that's a bigger proportion of the movie than you might expect. Gerard Butler actually spends the bulk majority of the movie in a malfunctioning/exploding sci-fi space station, which is nothing to complain about, because the space disaster scenes actually look super impressive. In fact, I think the space scenes were actually worth my IMAX 3D ticket more than the weather scenes.

Other things of note: I thought it was pretty funny that at one point Gerard Butler's American character randomly points out that he was actually born in the UK. It's like someone behind the camera realized that his American accent sounds kinda wobbly and wrote in that line as a clever way of excusing it.

Rating: 86

10

Content: 86 , Size: 1194

Going into the cinema with a friend we were both really looking forward to this movie, as soon as it ended I made sure I rated it 10 out of 10, he looked at me and thought I was crazy. I looked at him and told him

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

that it was better than 2012, movies like this according to him need to have more action in them, I disagreed. I believe this movie had all the elements necessary for a great movie, the highlight for me was the screenplay, the dialogue and the acting which were all tremendous. Every character played his/her part well and with real emotion. I was not in any way disappointed, I went to see a movie that I had a great expectations about and I walked out of the cinema feeling very satisfied. All these negative reviews am I seeing for this movie don't make sense, I think that we need to focus more on the individual elements that make up movies, not just looking at the movie as a whole. I would not have made any changes to the script or any of the parts, it was visually engaging for the majority of the time and I would recommend it to anyone who not only likes a bit of action but some light hearted moments as well. Definitely would see this again, no doubt about it.

Rating: 87

10

Content: 87 , Size: 2403

Tesla Tesla Tesla

This movie has Elon Musk written all over it.

It's about a space engineer trying to fix a weather-controlling satellite before a massive disaster, the Geostorm, with a pretty big budget, and a great cast, including the well-known guys like Gerald Butler, Ed Harris and Andy Garcia, it succeed to deliver. Ultimately, Geostorm is a solid enough movie, with good directing, great music, good acting, and possibly one of the craziest disaster movies out there.

Gerald Butler is great as the troubled Jake. The crew of the ISS is also great, particularly Alexandra Maria Lara as Commander Ute, Eugenio Derbez as Hernandez, and Amr Waked (who I at first thought it's Antonio Banderas) as Dussette. Ed Harris is amazing as Leonard Dekkom, and Andy Garcia is also very good as President Palma. Jim Sturgess as Max, however is wooden at times, so does Abbie Cornish as Secret Service agent Sarah Wilson, although she did got some bad ass moments which is great.

The movie pushed the boundaries of believability, and presents us with probably one of the most craziest, over-the-top doomsday scenario ever put on film. Frozen on the Afghanistan desert, extreme heat on Hong Kong, and massive tsunami in Dubai is just one of the examples of how over-the-top, but still enjoyable film. It's a solid mark on Devlin's directorial work, and we can expect to see him directing again soon. The story's focus about climate change actually helps in adding tension and kept us imagining what happened if these disasters happened in real life. The humor is also well executed, and worked, especially those who seems to came straight outta a meme(Marry Her! - the president). The editing is also, very well done. Intense scenes felt very intense. Action scenes felt very exciting, and emotional scenes felt very impactful. They also tried at concealing the plot twist in the movie, and they did very well. The cinematography is good, and the music is

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

also, very good, another remarkable work by Lorne Balfe. What does surprise me is it's political subplot, which actually, a great idea (but leads to one of my gripes with this movie).

Geostorm is insanity at it's finest. The over-the-top plot, along with great cast, good performance and an all-out spectacle of destruction makes it a enjoyable ride from start to finish.

Rating: 88

7

Content: 88 , Size: 1694

I saw a pre-screening of Happy Death Day and let me tell you, it was one of the most fun theater experiences I've had. The movie doesn't take itself too seriously, which is definitely for the best. If anyone walks into a movie about a sorority girl living the same day over and over and being killed over and over and expects it to be some genre-defying horror perfection, that's on them.

However, that doesn't mean this is a bad movie by any means. Jessica Rothe as Tree Gelbman and Israel Broussard as Carter Davis are fantastic as the two leads. They have excellent chemistry and make us root for them. Rothe's character wasn't the typical horror movie sorority girl, either. She was cunning and badass. She made us believe she could actually figure this mess out. If you don't change your mind on who the killer is at least twice throughout the film, you aren't paying attention.

There are curveballs thrown left and right, which made my theater gasp and yell numerous times. You think the movie is about to end on at least two different occasions. The script is smart, there's horror, there's comedy, there's drama. Happy Death Day takes you in numerous directions, while also making sure you have fun along the way. This is definitely one of my all-time favorite campy horror flicks out there. It even pokes fun at Groundhog Day, which it very clearly took some inspiration from. I recommend this to anyone who enjoys horror; again, it doesn't redefine the genre and there are definitely an abundance of clichés. With that, though, there are still a handful of clever moments I certainly was not expecting.

Rating: 89

8

Content: 89 , Size: 1533

When I saw the trailer for this movie I admit I rolled my eyes and groaned that they were trotting out the circular time gimmick again. It was of course classic in Groundhog Day, but never seemed to click since then. I was dubious, but after seeing it with my own eyes, I can say I had a great time. I'm not sure if Blum House intended it to be funny, but it had a lot of humor in it, enough I would say to qualify it as a dark comedy. The cast was superb and while it didn't offer anything

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

groundbreaking in terms of murders/deaths, I didn't mind because the story was so well connected and it really had me guessing right up until the end. Another litmus test for the quality of this movie is that the audience was rather quiet during the presentation. I've been to enough of these films to know that when you get a young audience seated in the dark and the film is a snooze, they'll start to talk and whisper and just annoy the Hell out of you. This movie managed to hold the attention of the entire audience and in this day and age I must say, that is an achievement in and of itself. I wasn't prepared to enjoy Happy Death Day as much as I did, but even I can admit when I was wrong. It worked from start to finish. I wasn't aware that Scott Lobdell wrote the script, but when I saw his name in the credits, I realized another reason I enjoyed it. I am familiar with his writing in the comic book industry and he is one of the more notable scribes. It's good to see the skills transfer.

Rating: 90

8

Content: 90 , Size: 1245

I think people going to see this movie are expecting wayyyy too much from a slasher movie. I'm rating it based on what I expected, and I was certainly impressed. This movie wasn't trying to be anything more than another murder movie, but what made me want to see it was the idea of taking Groundhog Day (which it fully admitted to ripping the idea from) and turning it into a slasher film. I was actually surprised it held back on gore and blood. I was fully expecting it to be all the tropes of gross-out killings, but it was instead focused more on character development and the story. I admit the characters are a bit one-dimensional, but again, it's a slasher movie. It's trying to win any academy awards here. In many ways I think it's parodying those one-dimensional characters of college trope characters and the "last girl" in horror movies because it goes all-in on establishing the main characters as somebody you're meant to hate at first. The ending genuinely took me in a direction I didn't anticipate, and then it took me back to what I was expecting, but did it in a way that I felt fresh. All in all, I had fun watching this movie, which I think was what this movie was meant to be: Fun.

Rating: 91

10

Content: 91 , Size: 763

I went into Happy Death Day with low expectations, thinking it would be a fun yet cheesy horror movie. I was right about one thing: it's very, very fun. Now, don't let the frightening trailer fool you: this is a not a very scary movie. Yes, there are some tense moments, usually followed by a jump scare, and there was moderate PG-13 violence, but

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

this movie succeeds more in its one-liners than its death sequences. There are tons of good jokes from Jessica Rothe, who is the best part of this movie by far. And there is a twist, it's not very memorable, but it's smart and well thought out, and it leads to a very satisfying end fight scene. Despite the misleading marketing, Happy Death Day is an hilarious and entertaining horror/comedy.

Rating: 92

9

Content: 92 , Size: 684

This type of movie has been done many times before and rarely succeeds, but this one was a hit for me!

Jessica Rothe's performance is what kept me interested... she nailed her character and was convincing and funny as well.

I don't want to give too much away, but the twists towards the end were a nice surprise and earned a few extra points from me.

It's classified as a Horror, Mystery, Thriller but it's also a comedy as I found myself laughing a bunch of times.

Certainly a must-see entertaining film produced and executed very well, much better than many other films in this genre.

It's a well deserved 9/10 from me.

Rating: 93

10

Content: 93 , Size: 1646

I'm starting to see a trend develop in modern horror movies (the good ones at least) and I really like it. Film makers are beginning to realise that for horror to work there has to be some different levels to the film. 90 minutes of watching people get killed isn't going to be able to cut it anymore. You have to be able to make the audience laugh, think and even move them emotionally. If you can do that then your film will be a success. Earlier this year
Get Out
 pulled it off and now
Happy Death Day
 has nailed it too.

When the opening logos featured a joke (literally in the first few seconds of the film) I thought I may have misread the tone of the film in the trailers. Turns out I had, but in a good way. It wasn't an indication that the film was to be a laugh-fest, simply that it had that layer to it. And the thing about the layers that the film possesses is that every one of them works. Whatever it tries to pull off it manages.

The twists and turns and how crafty it is about concealing them truly blew me away. At least three times I thought to myself such and such element would be better if they'd done so and so, only to later find out they did indeed have that up their sleeve the whole time. The film is incredibly smart.

I can't say enough good things about this film. The trailers won't give

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

a fair indication to people of what this film is truly capable of, and so sadly I fear many who would love it will not get around to seeing it. If you get the chance though please do see it. It's a fantastic film and you won't be disappointed.

Rating: 94

7

Content: 94 , Size: 1875

The trailer for this film accompanied by 50 Cent's "In Da Club" looked incredibly dumb, but that didn't mean that the film wasn't going to be a stupid good time. These types of repetition of a certain day films are somewhat popular with recent incarnations being completely forgettable. Groundhog Day gets it right, and I was curious to see a college slasher drama try to take a different spin on the idea.

The film is about Tree Gelbman, a typical short fused sorority girl who loves to party and get drunk and her trials against a day that keeps repeating. On her birthday she is murdered and the day keeps resetting until she can figure out who her killer is. The daily death takes a toll on her body and she gets physically weaker each time. its a tough task having to try to figure things out when everything around her resets and the killer and his/her motivations remain unknown.

Jessica Rothe was just perfect for this role. She's an attractive lead who played the college girl role to a tee. Her character grows by the end of the film and you start to feel a better connection with her as she becomes a different human being when her constant death teaches her about her own life. Other than that, there aren't really many fleshed

out or identifiable characters, which is fine. This is a cheap thriller and should be treated as such, doesn't mean it isn't entertaining.

The repetition surprisingly doesn't overstay its welcome and keeps itself fun. This film is barely a horror because it's so stupid and the film knows it. It's more of a comedy with killing than anything else. Which is perfectly fine. The killer reveal is kind of obvious despite the writers trying to twist you away from it. Overall, you won't have much of an impression from this picture but it makes for a good time in the cinema.

6.5/10

Rating: 95

7

Content: 95 , Size: 1461

Jessica Rothe is amusingly pithy and savvy playing a selfish college beauty, a spoiled sorority sister who rules the school until she is stabbed and killed on her way to a surprise birthday party by a masked lunatic. But fate plays this campus cutie an unusual hand once she discovers she's living her birthday over and over again, each time attempting to cheat death but always running into her attacker. Screenwriter Scott Lobdell isn't trying to sneak a slasher variant of 'Groundhog Day' passed us--he's upfront about the similarities, even exalts in them, while toying with all the possibilities such a scenario can offer. It takes Rothe three tries to fully comprehend what's happening to her; once she formulates a plan (creating a suspect list), Lobdell mixes things up, so that the movie rarely feels repetitive. Our heroine, snarky to start, follows Bill Murray's example and becomes a better person on her twisted journey (reestablishing contact with her father, apologizing to her roommate, even causing her own demise on one occasion to prevent the cute nerd from the boys' dorm from losing his life). Director Christopher B. Landon deserves credit for delivering a modern-day thriller with lots of action but no gore and no nudity. If it isn't quite a family-friendly slasher flick, it certainly is a

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

squirrelly, sassy one, with some big laughs counterbalancing the suspense. Good show! *** from ****

Rating: 96

10

Content: 96 , Size: 2101

The terror in Happy Death Day is the movie's comedy, as the point is to represent the compromise of eternity being allowed to experience censorship as a means to its existence.

Eternity is an impossible venture without origin. Origin is therefore something which isn't infinite, and for the sake of juxtaposition is destructive. The origin which is meant to hurt is the paradox of being meant to help eternity come to fruition.

Further juxtaposition, is that eternity itself becomes a force which isn't based around being for the sake of anything. Eternity is the end product of visual symmetry, but for the connection between eternity and visual symmetry to operate, the nature of the visual symmetry has to comprise nervousness. The internal state of conflict that defines the visual symmetry is the logic of the visual symmetry being its own self-supporter, even though eternity was never completely independent.

In Happy Death Day, visual symmetry is the end product, and the compromise of its status as an end product is that its composition is pointlessness and nervousness. In contrast, visual hierarchy sets the movie off, and the usual composition of visual hierarchy is assumption and objective. Theresa's story goes from visual hierarchy to visual symmetry, and the hierarchy elements are based around meeting objectives, while the equality elements are based around past events.

So in essence, Happy Death Day is the style of hierarchy being about future objectives, and equality being about the past as the contrast is the representation of the symbiotic relationship between eternity and its point of origin.

Of course, all of this makes Happy Death Day into a film which is excellent, inspiring and moving. Jessica Rothe is fantastic as Theresa Gelbman, and it's precisely her story that represents the complexity of loneliness being a virtuous concept. Happy Death Day is a much more intellectual movie than most other horror films - and most other comedies period.

By a long stretch, one of the best movies of 2017

Rating: 97

8

Content: 97 , Size: 2752

With Halloween coming up, I started taking a look at what Horror movies were being shown on the big screen. Finding Vincenzo Natali's *Haunter* (which has the same "hook", but a darker tone) to be superb, I was excited to spot a film on the big screen with a similar set-up, which led to me joining in the Death Day.

The plot:

Waking up with a killer

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

hangover on her birthday, Theresa "Tree"; Gelbman pushes fellow student Carter Davis to the side, and spends the entire day being grumpy to everyone, from binning a birthday cupcake her roommate Lori makes, to ignoring her dad's invitation to meet up (Tree's late mum had the same birthday.) Going to a party later that night, Tree is stopped in her tracks by a masked stranger, who gets out a knife and kills her. Expecting to be dead, Tree instead finds herself re-living her birthday (where the same person kills her.) Caught in a time-loop, Tree starts trying to find out who the masked killer is, in order to stop her unhappy death day.

View on the film:

Setting the timer, the screenplay by X-Men Comic-Book writer Scott Lobdell spends the opening 15 minutes cheekily ribbing the clichés of the Slasher genre, via Davis being the well-meaning pretty boy, Tree being the popular, mean "it girl";, and Tree's entire clique being based around showing the nerds who really is too cool for school. Catching Tree in a time loop, Lobdell gives the shiny Slash shocks sharp, underlying psychological terror, as each time she is murdered, leads to Tree getting increasingly raw fears that she will never escape the loop. Along with slicing up over a dozen, weapons- grade "Final Girl" battles, Lobdell takes an excellent stab at Horror-Comedy, that shines in each attempt Tree makes to survive the day, from Tree walking round the campus care-free and naked, to the headache Tree gets of having to re-live a deadly morning routine.

Perfectly stepping in time with Lobdell, director Christopher Landon & cinematographer Toby Oliver turn the Slasher Knife with an irresistible Pop-Rock atmosphere, of whip-pans around the campus, and neon lights over the killings that creates a party mood. Backed by a jumpy score from Bear McCreary and a great mask designed by "Ghostface" creator Tony Gardner, Landon gets into the Slasher groove with ultra-stylised tracking shots following Tree and the psycho, and overlapping slo-mo eyeing the wear and tear Tree experiences in the loop. The only one aware of what is happening, Jessica Rothe gives an excellent performance as Tree, whose sarcastic dry-wit Rothe hits with a real relish, that transforms into a tough, thoughtful confidence, as Tree wishes her killer a happy death day.

Rating: 98

7

Content: 98 , Size: 775

I had low expectations and I have to say they were totally exceeded .

This is an enjoyable Romantic Horror with more than a passing reference to GROUNDHOG DAY - and the occasional reminiscing of the 15 year old Shaun of the dead . Plus a bit of Scream , scary movie and a number of other slasher movies .

Jessica Roshe was brilliant in the starring role , you believe in her character , her charm was endearing and despite the 10 years between

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

her character and actual age she played the combination of innocent romantic with a touch a modern feisty independent female in control of her own destiny .

The only poor point was how the inevitable twist was handled - that could have been slightly better but definitely worth seeing .

Pad.A 7/10

Rating: 99

7

Content: 99 , Size: 2718

I was pretty excited to see this movie. I loved "Before I Fall" and I also love Horror/Thriller films....so seeing that "Happy Death Day" was a combination of both of those things, I decided that I should go see it.

I honestly thought this film was pretty decent....even though it wasn't quite as good as I wanted it to be.

The biggest problem was that this movie didn't scare me at all. I might have felt a little spooked just once...but that hardly the "OMG I so scared god!! Argh!!" type reaction that the movie wanted me to have. None of the scary/suspenseful scenes really got me. I feel like this happened because this movie tried to be two things at once. It tried to be a drama like "Before I Fall" while also trying to be scary like "Scream" yet only ends up being OK in both ends of the spectrum. It feels like "a jack of all trades master of none" situation.

The other problem was the exposition involving our heroine was poorly handled. Not spoil things...basically our protagonist actually has a backstory....but it is given so little substance and emotional weight that it was just meh. It also isn't as integrated into the story as well as it could have been. I feel that her backstory could have been more developed and/or given more emotional impact.

Despite these problems, I still enjoyed the film.

I liked the plot. Even though I never felt scared, the movie gave me more than enough interest for me to be invested in the story for the entire run time. It will most certainly keep you engaged. And I think the pay off to that story was pretty good, even if it felt a bit rushed in hindsight.

I also enjoyed the performances. Obviously none of them are going to be Oscar-winning material, but I think they did the job well enough that I felt immersed in what was going on. So good job guys!!

Another thing that I liked was that I didn't find myself cringing constantly like I do with other horror media like the "Scream TV show." Never once did I find myself rolling my eyes whenever someone open their mouth. Is the dialogue particularly memorable? Not really. But the fact that it wasn't a total cringe fest was certainly great news for me

Lastly, I thought the pacing was pretty decent. I did find it slow at times, but the story had enough going on that I never once felt bored or irritated or anything like that.

Overall, I found this movie to be reasonably enjoyable. Despite it's flaws, I found the story and the performances enjoyable enough that I

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

can say that I had a good enough time. I give this film 3.5/5 stars.

Rating: 100

8

Content: 100 , Size: 501

This film is really one of a kind. It does a terrific job of evoking fear, as well as making you laugh out loud. The film itself is satirical in nature. It truly is a film everyone should go see, and is enjoyable for all ages. The film builds up well, and continues to succeed up until the end. The ending is very outrageous in nature, and seems to be a forced plot twist filled with ridiculous exposition. The ending will either leave you amused, or just disappointed. This film is worth it though!

Rating: 101

6

Content: 101 , Size: 1616

Happy Death Day comes from Blumhouse Productions, the studio made famous for the resurgence of horror in theaters (Get Out, The Purge, Insidious). However, this is the lightest of light thrills. Sure, it would fit in the slasher movie bin, but with its bubble gum aesthetics and goofy comedy, it's really more Freaky Friday than Friday the 13th. And in that sense, it's mildly charming…if not bright enough to be great. For starters, the premise is pretty stupid, and the execution of that premise isn't much better. A brash and awful sorority girl is forced to relive the same birthday over and over, each one ending in her own murder by a masked killer. Imagine Groundhog Day or Edge of Tomorrow, but in the teen-screams genre and with a lot less complexity. In fact, most of its "originality" just comes in its blanket theft from other properties and throwing them all together: the youth world of Mean Girls; the comedy of "Scream Queens"; the protagonist from "The Good Place"; the scares from The Purge. It's not bad, just familiar, like we're reliving this recognizable movie just as the character relives her day. Once our girl starts trying to solve the whodunit-mystery, things get more assured and fun, as we find it easier to root for her and her insistence on not dying each day ad infinitum. Even though the deaths and scares are wanting, the other elements work, especially the humor and (gasp!) the heart. It's harmless and forgettable October fare, made more for people who hate horror than me. In other words, my wife will love it.

Rating: 102

1

Content: 102 , Size: 1262

Happy Death Day is one of the worst horror films of 2017. The cast is

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

highly irritating, and just forgettable. Tree Gelbman yes you read that right, the main character is named Tree, played by Jessica Rothe. Her character is nothing that I even care for, just an ignorant girl from a rich family acting like she is better than anyone around her, her sorority sisters are just as pathetic. So here we sit watching some over privileged character walk through the steps of a "Groundhog Day" style film, living her death over and over again, which was portrayed in the trailer.

Scott Lobdell was the writer for this terrible film, and in my opinion highly plagiarized from Groundhog Day, except this hack of a writer will not be sued because the story was tweaked enough and he turned it into a horror slasher style film, instead of a comedy.

If people want to pay money to see such drivel then by all means, go right ahead. There is no likable character, I wanted them all to die, and there is no point to see this film unless it's something to fall asleep to. That's it folks move along now nothing to see here. 6.7 is a fake rating made by this fake website and fake people. This is a big old zero people. Avoid at all costs.

Rating: 103

5

Content: 103 , Size: 1193

Comedy, horror drama. The heroine played by Jessica Rothe is murdered at the end of her birthday! The murderer is disguised by a 'baby face' mask, and she immediately wakes up at the beginning of the same day, over and over and over again. She now knows what will happen during the course of the repeating day and we then see her murdered again, each time in a different manner.

Every time she wakes we see that she has suffered some injury relevant to the murder, and these accumulate over the passing days. Her urgent need is to slowly piece together the evidence in the course of each repeating day until she can determine who the killer is. Every morning her frustration grows but at least she slowly progresses towards knowing who the killer is. Every morning we see her realise that reliving the same day gives her the opportunity to slowly learn how to be a better person.

Comparison with 'Ground Hog Day' and 'Edge of Tomorrow' are inevitable – GHD is even referenced at the end during a brief conversation.

Jessica Rothe's performance is the only thing stopping this feeling like a very low budget made for T.V. movie.

Rating: 104

8

Content: 104 , Size: 1645

If you get a strong sense of déjà vu watching Happy Death Day, that's because it takes the basic premise of Bill Murray classic Groundhog Day

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

and adds a whole heap of familiar slasher clichés. But whilst undeniably derivative, the film still manages to be huge fun. At first one wonders whether it will succeed in offering anything beyond its high-concept mash-up premise, but as things progress it becomes clear that we're in safe hands, writer Scott Lobdell delivering a clever and witty script with director Christopher Landon confidently handling the action so that repetition never seems boring. Replacing Murray's obnoxious weatherman is attractive but self-obsessed sorority bitch Tree (Jessica Rothe) whose birthday brings an unexpected surprise; death! a psycho in a mask attacking her as she makes her way to a party. To Tree's horror, she is forced to relive the day again and again until she can work out the identity of her murderer and prevent herself from being killed. As in Groundhog Day, Tree is able to change the course of her repeated day with the knowledge she has gleaned, and ultimately becomes a much nicer person in the process. In the Andie MacDowell role is Israel Broussard as nice guy Carter Davis, who tries to help Tree with her terrible predicament. Equal parts wry comedy and PG friendly horror, Happy Death Day isn't about to scare your socks off, but thanks to fine performances from a solid cast, some imaginative plot twists, and a snappy pace, it's still hugely entertaining stuff that should appeal to horror and non-horror fans alike.

Rating: 105

7

Content: 105 , Size: 621

I was pleasantly surprised by this film! I went in expecting it to be a repetitive storyline incorporating a mad man in a stereotypical doll mask. I can truthfully say it definitely surprised me! As seen in the previews, Tree is reliving her birthday over and over, trying to figure out the man behind the mask. While the movie is a thriller, it was really the surprising pop ups that get you. I really recommend this movie to anyone finding themselves wanting a fun movie that isn't only going to make you spill your popcorn, but also leave the theatre thinking about everything you just watched unfold on screen.

Rating: 106

6

Content: 106 , Size: 3712

Saw Happy Death Day; as somebody who was fascinated by the concept, found the advertising interesting and good enough to warrant a view and who appreciates horror when done well. Seeing it just before Halloween as part of my Halloween celebrations, will admit to not being as bowled over by the film as would have liked but enjoying it a good deal. As surprisingly interesting as the advertising was (and there has been some dreadful advertising this year, a notable recent example being the

completely mis-marketed 'Geostorm'), it is also misleading. One would expect a truly frightening film judging from the trailers, but actually 'Happy Death Day' happened to be much more than what was indicated and wasn't what one would call terrifying or sleep-with-the-light-on-for-a-week. The good news is that 'Happy Death Day' actually makes the most of its concept, refreshing having seen films recently that had concepts that they didn't do anywhere near enough with. The not so good news is that as enjoyable as it was it did feel like something was missing.

It is easy to see why lots of people will like, and have liked 'Happy Death Day'. It is just as easy to see why it will be, and has been, a let-down for others. My opinion has shades of both, leaning towards the former. 'Happy Death Day' may be somewhat standard (while the concept is a pretty unique one, some of the story elements aren't), superficial (other than the lead character, the characters are developed very flimsily) and some parts don't make as much sense as they could and feel unfinished.

Was expecting more from the killer twist reveal, which is not as clever and surprising as one would like and the whole ending felt rather silly and rushed to me (the killer's motive also came over as really trivial for an elaborate set-up). A little slow to begin with too, it's once the concept kicks in when 'Happy Death Day' properly comes to life and maintains that energy for the rest of the film.

For all those faults though, 'Happy Death Day' is also refreshingly self-aware, almost very much aware of its standard-ness and superficiality and acknowledges it, and manages to be lots of fun, creepy-suspenseful and surprisingly thought-provoking. Gruesomely funny sums it up very well.

'Happy Death Day' is a long way from amateurish visually, the photography is stylish rather than slapdash, the editing has suitably unnerving moments and the lighting is atmospheric. Christopher Landon never lets it get too heavy while not diluting the fun or scares, and the at times haunting and at others times funky soundtrack adds a lot.

When it comes to the script, 'Happy Death Day' is full of knowing humour and never removes its tongue from its cheek, instead keeping it firmly intact throughout which proved to come off really well. It also really makes one think. The story execution is not perfect, but it's never dull and has some neat twists and turns that stops it from being predictable and repetitive.

Jessica Rothe should become a bigger star after her excellent lead turn here, she has been acting a few years before this but this is the first time where she really held my attention and allowed me to take proper notice of her. Israel Broussard is also very believable and the two have great chemistry together. The acting on the whole is solid but essentially it's all about Rothe and she is one of the main reasons why 'Happy Death Day' is worth a viewing.

Overall, a long way from perfect but quite enjoyable. 6/10 Bethany Cox

Rating: 107

7

Content: 107 , Size: 2685

I had a blast with this film and i absolutely loved it

Yes I know this concept has been done before; Groundhog Day, Source Code, Edge of Tomorrow and etc

BUT this film adds a new spin on the "same day repeats until the mystery is solved" concept by taking it and merging it with a slasher film premise

Now this kind of film could easily go downhill if wrongly executed but Happy Death Day does a decent job of handling this concept

It has fun with it and pokes fun at it

The film is also a bit self aware of the clichés and tropes of the slasher genre so it's understandable when something a bit dumb happens

It wastes no time and you can easily breeze through the entire film without feeling any fatigue because every twist and turn in the film keeps it fresh and entertaining and keeps you on the edge of your seat, it's also of the right run time, just 1 hour 35 something minutes which felt right for this film

It's very well shot too surprisingly, I don't think I've seen any of Chris Landon(the director of this film)'s work before but he impressed me with this film

There is a lot of humor which adds to the film because the film doesn't take itself too seriously and doesn't take a very dark route even though it is still a horror film

It also has some cool scares and suspenseful moments, not too scary but that's fine by me because of the rest of the film kept me engaged

I have to mention the lead actress because my review would not be complete without mentioning her, Jessica Roth did a fantastic job as the lead girl in this film, her performance was so charismatic and its apparent that she enjoyed this role a lot because she delivered a better performance than i expected, A break out star performance and i hope to see her in more films now

And not just the performance, her character development in the film was simple but handled well, and combined with her performance, it made her character and her performance very likable

The mystery of the film is engaging although once it is revealed, you might criticize some parts of it but overall the film worked so little problems can be overlooked

The soundtrack is cool too, i looked for some of the songs after the film ended and i got hooked

It may not be a classic or a genre defining film but if you just want to forget your problems and have a fun time with maybe an easy to watch film, pick this up, Would be even better if you watch it in a group with maybe your friends, it'll be a good experience because Happy Death Day is very enjoyable

Rating: 108

6

Content: 108 , Size: 1903

The trailer for "Happy Death Day" doesn't do the actual movie justice, something we see the other way around more often. I have to admit that partially because of this I was skeptical about it, only to be pleasantly surprised by the time the credits rolled. Don't get me wrong, in no way is this film supposed to be taken too seriously, yet I am glad that one is not forced to completely lower their standards to enjoy it.

Jessica Rothe's performance is great, even in the beginning of the movie where she is pretty much a total douche bag to everyone she somehow manages to come off quite charming and charismatic. And that's the thing about Happy Death Day; it's not necessarily a cinematic masterpiece, yet it has some kind of easy breezy charm to it which makes you curious.

The writers make the audience play a guessing game, more specifically "who killed me?" by (quite cleverly) introducing all suspects on the first day. Then it's up to the audience to decide who is most likely, or better yet unlikely the killer. The answer was neither shocking nor predictable, that's the only thing that left me unimpressed. Instead of having that "omg no way" moment you will probably be more like "huh? wait? it was them?". The reveal of the killer to be confusing is a flaw that cannot be overlooked, because it is what the entire movie has led up to.

But other than that Happy Death Day was an entertaining watch, I would especially love to see more from Jessica Rothe. In a way the story line feels like a homage to the oh-so lovable classics it has drawn inspiration from. I guess that's reason enough to go and check it out. Be sure not to go into it too critically tough, it's hard to take a movie serious when the ones poking most fun at it (in an innocent way) are the creators themselves.

Rating: 109

7

Content: 109 , Size: 3238

Although the core narrative is not original by any stretch, there are good reasons for liking this lightweight foray into the slasher genre. There are some original elements incorporated into the hoary old Groundhog Day chestnut "just enough dusting and polishing to make you forgive the pillaging. It doesn't aim for the same conceptual depth of, say, Timecrimes (2007), Triangle (2009), The Butterfly Effect (2004) or Edge of Tomorrow (2014) but it does manage to incorporate a nifty murder mystery thread into the time-loop motif and the execution feels a deal fresher than it probably should.

Bratty, morally challenged and egocentric frat girl Tree (Jessica

Rothe) finds herself living her birthday over and over again, each day ending with her murder at the hands of a masked stalker. All she has to do is find out the identity of her killer and avoid being killed in order to break the cycle. The film is not hard core or extreme in any sense that might apply to the bulk of modern slasher flicks. There are no real scares, there is no excess of blood and guts, no explicit violence, no torture porn or gratuitous sexual activity or nudity. So what does it have going for it?

It's engaging, mildly funny in places and generally quite likable.

Jessica Rothe is winningly cute in the lead. And not in a painfully forced or superficial way. Her gradual transition from selfish and self-absorbed sorority bitch to a more enlightened and humane persona is skilfully handled. You start out thinking she pretty much deserves her fate and then end up rooting for her to succeed. Rothe plays it just right and you can't help liking her. She is one of the most rounded and sympathetic female leads in a slasher movie since Jamie Lee Curtis in Carpenter's original Halloween (1978). In fairness, most of the cast deliver in terms of injecting some level of believability and personality into their rather clichéd stock characters.

HDD deserves credit for some stylish camera-work and editing & both of which are tight, smart and in some places strikingly unusual. The key emphasis is on taking a well-worn concept, playing around with it and having fun. And that's what you've got here, a fun genre piece that doesn't take itself seriously and entertains for the running time. Unlike *Scream* it doesn't lose itself in self-reverential satire and admiration for its own cleverness in ragging on genre tropes, and is all the better for it.

It doesn't do anything ground-breaking or jolting, won't set the world on fire, and anyone expecting a visceral thrill-ride is more than likely to feel short-changed. But, I found it enjoyable enough, even though I'm far removed & very far removed & from its target audience. And I must add that I was wrong-footed by the ending, fully expecting the stock horror movie twist which isn't really a twist anymore & the one where you think everything's OK but suddenly evil triumphs. The twist this time around was a bit different to what I'd resigned myself to. And *Groundhog Day* does get a belated name check.

So all in all, not bad, just about happy enough.

Rating: 110

8

Content: 110 , Size: 679

Happy death day is one of those films that turns out to be miles better than what the trailer offers you to go watch it.

Plot is interesting Tree (Jessica rothe) wakes up and relives the same day by getting killed over and over again and has to figure out who is the killer to stop this endless cycle.

Groundhog Day meets *Scream*, now it may sound a bit crazy but

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Christopher Landon (director) pulls off a great film in the way it's been shot and put together.

With some great acting, light hearted humour and a mystery that will keep you guessing right till the end Happy Death Day is a great horror/thriller and definitely one to watch this Halloween.

Rating: 111

5

Content: 111 , Size: 2603

Some friends invited me for a horror mystery thriller movie, so all fine by me.

But then, the film started.... This was no horror film. Most of the movie felt like American Pie having the naked scenes replaced with some serial killer slaying again and again the same person without any obvious reason(or any reason whatsoever as I realized in the end).

Anyway, the actors were not memorable. Their acting skills were okay. I guess they would seem as something more to a teenager and this is why I am amazed by the number of good reviews this film got. The plot moves along in a totally predictable manner. We see repeatedly the same day of a rich sorority girl waking up in the room of some guy who was kind enough to pick up her pieces after she got wasted the night before. Then she goes on her day and gets killed in slightly different manner every night. Then wakes up at the guys dorm again and everything starts happening again until she finally realizes that she is trapped in a triangle-like situation. The theme is one we know all too well,so nothing much to expect there(so much for the thriller and mystery). The protagonist tries to explore some ways of solving the 'mystery' but drops them all really fast so we see pretty much more of the same with tiny variations,while she tries to act all scared and panicked. Each morning finds her more screamier than the one before and the in-the-mean-time- reactions make things a bit funny or cringy. Certainly not scary or thrilling.

The main problem with this movie is that it tries to pass itself as some horror,mystery film while it's a comedy- crime/light mystery, if it has to be called something. It's a total joke of a horror movie. And it would be amusing if it was advertised as such. You cringe,you laugh but you certainly don't feel any threat at any point. And that's understandable since you have little time to learn anything about any of the characters. What do we know? She dates and sleeps around,not surprising for a sorority girl. She gets scared when they try to kill her, but that's a normal reaction for any human being. After reliving the same thing over and over she decides to stop repeating her actions and explore other possibilities, so nothing really interesting here either.

In the end we had a movie with much more laughter than the amount justified for a horror film,no plot,not a deep mystery,in contrast to what we expected and no interesting characters. But we still managed to have some fun with this thrash dialogue film. Not really worth seeing.

Rating: 112

9

Content: 112 , Size: 1037

I thought this was just a cheap slasher movie version of groundhog day.

Oddly enough it was. Girl wakes up in a dorm room goes about her day then gets murdered before the day ends just to repeat the day again and again with her murder hiding they're identity behind a mask.

Here is the surprise though. This movie is actually good! The girl is the stereotypical bitchy (or witchy if they've censored the movie like they did over here) cheerleader. Pretty much every single person in her life has a reason to want her dead. This works as you go through the list of suspects (sometimes hilariously) and don't feel bad seeing her die over and over.

It more then earns the big reveal in the end and I found it to be a fun light hearted popcorn movie for Halloween.

This movie got one extra point for being bold enough to actually straight up say "hey, you know what your story reminds me off? Groundhog day, that movie with Bill Murray." right at the end before the closing credits.

Rating: 113

6

Content: 113 , Size: 5617

It was a fantastic coincidence this film came out close to when I was celebrating my 30th birthday, the trailer for this scary movie looked great, a cross between Groundhog Day and Scream, "Groundhog Slay" if you like, from Blumhouse Productions (Insidious, Whiplash, Get Out), so I was really looking forward to it. Basically Teresa "Tree" Gelbman (La La Land's Jessica Rothe) wakes up on her birthday, Monday 18th September, in the dorm room of classmate Carter Davis (Israel Broussard) following a heavy night of drinking. Tree leaves and spends the day being self-centered, dismissive and condescending to her fellow classmates and previous hook-ups, ignores calls from her father, throws away a cupcake made by her roommate Lori Spengler (Ruby Modine, Matthew's daughter), and is having an affair with her professor Gregory Butler (Charles Aitken). That night, Tree is heading to her "surprise" birthday party, when she is lured into a tunnel, there she is murdered by a hooded figure wearing a baby mask, the campus mascot. Tree wakes up in the morning, in the same dorm as before, and the previous day's events repeat, unnerved Tree relives the same day again, but avoids the tunnel. Instead she returns to the sorority house for her party, Tree enjoys herself and quickly hooks up with her classmate Nick Sims (Blaine Kern III), but the masked killer is there, he murders Nick, then kills her. Tree is terrified to find herself repeating events all over again, she is trapped in a time loop, she avoids her death this

time by barricading herself in her room, but she is murdered again when the killer was hiding in the bathroom. During the next loop, Tree tells her story to Carter, he suggests she take advantage of the loop, make a list of all the suspects to figure out who is trying to kill her, she spends the next few loops following suspected students, all of which end up with her murdered as she stalks the wrong person each time. Tree also takes advantage of her situation and enjoys the reactions of everyone seeing her walk around the campus completely naked. On the next loop, Tree passes out following her previous death, being bludgeoned by a baseball bat, she is taken to hospital where she finds she has retained damaged from her other murders. Then she finds herself chased by the killer again through the hospital, until she escapes in Butler's car, while driving at high speed she is pulled over by a police officer, she volunteers to be arrested to avoid being killed, however the killer shows up and blows her up with leaking gas and a match. Waking up in Carter's bedroom again, Tree convinces him of the predicament knowing a number of events before they happen, going to a restaurant, she admits she doesn't like who she's become, including being distant from her father, since the death of her mother three years ago, they shared the same birthday. Tree sees the local news broadcast report, that serial killer Joseph Tombs (Rob Mello) is being held in the hospital, she concludes he is the masked killer. Tree races to the hospital to warn of Tombs' escape, the killer breaks free and nearly kills her, Carter follows and ends up killed by Tombs, Tree is chased into the bell tower, realising Carter will remain dead if she doesn't restart the loop, she hangs her from the tower. During the next loop, Tree spends her time righting the various wrongs she has caused, ending her affair with Dr. Butler, and meeting her father David (Jason Bayle) to resolve their situation. That night, Tree prepares to stop Tombs, he has the upper hand, but uses the knowledge of a blackout to disarm him and shoot him to death, she relieved to finally be free, and celebrates her birthday in her room, eating Lori's cupcake. However, the next morning, Tree is horrified to be waking up on her birthday again, killing Tombs did not stop the time loop, she is distraught and returns to her room to run away. Lori is there to offer her the cupcake again, Tree realises she died in her sleep, she never consumed the cupcake before, she realises Lori is the real killer, the cupcake is poisoned, and had access to Tombs with her job in the hospital. Lori confesses that she was jealous of Dr. Butler having an interest in Tree, the two fight, Tree manages to stuff the cupcake into Lori's mouth, before kicking her out of the window, she falls to her death. Tree and Carter reflect on the day's events back at the restaurant, he offer her his room for the night, and comments that her situation is the movie Groundhog Day. Tree wakes up the next morning, she believes she is in another loop when the first few events repeat, but then Carter tells her it is Tuesday 19th September, he pranked her, she is mad for a moment, but then they relax and kiss. Also starring Rachel Matthews as Danielle Bouseman, Phi Vu as Ryan Phan, Laura Clifton as

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Stephanie Butler and Ramsey Anderson as Keith Lumbly. Rothe is well cast as the college student who has so many flaws that there are plenty of people who would want to kill her, the time loop format has been done before in various genres, thrillers like Source Code and sci-fi like Edge of Tomorrow, this is one of the first in the scary movie category. It is not really that scary, it has the odd small jump and creepy element, but it is very witty, satirical with the campus setting, and making obvious jokes about its own slasher movie format, it is just an enjoyable popcorn movie and crowd pleaser, perfect if celebrating your birthday as well, a fun horror. Good!

Rating: 114

7

Content: 114 , Size: 985

What was so fun with the horror movies in the 90s was how they made people unlikable before giving us the joy of murdering them. The actress was incredible at being unbearable, I was excited to see her be killed... repeatedly.

I was disappointed by the lack of gore, but then I appreciated it as a clever suspense. And it sure delivered. She powerfully expressed her psychological distress.

It was very fun, movies that laugh at themselves are the best comedies.

It was actually deep and inspiring too about personal maturity and social interactions.

Seeing her relive the same day didn't feel repetitive, she doesn't just make different choices, her attitude becomes different too. I wasn't expecting much, but even when I do, I rarely get twists and endings this interesting. I'll gladly watch again!

I'm happy that more movies are using the Groundhog Day idea. Edge of Tomorrow was also interesting if you like science fiction.

Rating: 115

6

Content: 115 , Size: 2621

Happy Death Day Review By Jordan Whitten

Plot: A college student must relive the day of her murder over and over again, in a loop that will end only when she discovers her killer's identity.

Although the concept and idea was a copy of Groundhog day, it turned out to be a thrilling, mysterious and intense film with loads of drama and action. However, does that make it a good movie? I guess we'll find out more in this review of Happy Death Day.

The first thing I will say about this movie is that it is more funnier than scary. So if you're not a big fan of scary horror movies, there is literally nothing to be afraid of. You only encounter really 1 jump scare which is debatably scary, whether you are faint-hearted/timid

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

person you would be quite frightened.

The movie Happy Death Day featured the main character Tree Gelbman

(Jessica Rothe) and secondary main characters: Carter Davis (Israel Broussard), Lori Spengler (Ruby Modine), and Gregory Butler (Charles Aitken). Without a doubt the acting was great. Few errors were spotted throughout the whole motion picture. So no complaints there.

Other than that, the film felt like it was dragging on forever and it was never going to end. Considering it kept showing the same scenes over and over again which gradually got boring. Just when you think Tree might live to the next day, she doesn't, and that could really get you on your nerves and it frustrated me at one point in the movie. However, at the end of the movie when Tree finally discovered who her murderer is, I felt so relieved. After all the build up it all turned out to be quite useful in the end. It made the audience feel ecstatic. The film really keeps you guessing who the murderer is, I think it is an excellent movie in the mystery genre. I urged to discover who the killer was, I think it was it was killing me more than it was killing tree.

In conclusion, I personally think the movie is good, not great or amazing but just plain good. There were a couple faults I found in the movie, but there was also some really good things that happened in the film. It also shares some life lessons which is kinda neat. If you are going to see this motion picture, do not expect it to be a full on horror movie that will keep you on your feet. Although it does seem that away in the trailer, it's actually a really fun movie with Jessica Rothe saying a few funny jokes here and there. Happy Death Day is nothing that I expected it to be and I like that, hopefully you do too.

Personal Rating: 6.4/10 Is it worth watching: YES

Rating: 116

6

Content: 116 , Size: 4949

'HAPPY DEATH DAY' - 2017

Directed by Christopher B Landon{Scouts Guide to the Zombie Apocalypse}

Starring Jessica Rothe{La La Land} and Israel Broussard{Flipped}

Plot Overview: ​When a young University student awakens in the dormitory of a complete stranger, she must move through her day until she inevitably gets killed off. The catch? She must relive this same fate ever day until she can stop the seemingly omnipotent and omnipresent killer.

Going into this film, I expected a low rent slasher with a silly premise that I could write of a garbage. Well it certainly wasn't that. I was pleasantly surprised with this movie. It's a very fun Halloween movie. Don't go into it expecting the next big thing in terms of horror, go in expecting a fun comedy with horror elements and I think that you'll enjoy this movie very much.

What can I say that I liked about this movie, specifically? Well the tone was excellent. At the start, very few of the jokes hit for me so I

got a little bit worried. But as the film progressed, it became a genuinely good comedy. I tend to like Horror-Comedies because I don't like the feeling of being scared, and thus a joke or two helps calm me down. The way they blend the two genres in this movie is almost effortless. It definitely leans a little more onto the comedy aspect than horror, which will definitely turn off those who EXPECTED this to be a horror movie. It's maybe a 1/4 horror movie, 3/4 comedy? The creepy and jumpy moments worked, but they were infrequent. With the exception of ONE, jump scares were also non-existent in this movie. Thank the lord God for that! But to be fair, the one that they DO use was pretty effective and worked well. So as a whole, the tone for this movie was pretty darn excellent.

Another aspect of this movie that absolutely deserves praise, is

Jessica Rothe's performance as a Tree. Sorry, the character's name is Tree; the character is unfortunately not a tree. She is, actually, far from it. Most horror movies just substitute in a stereotype of a character and expect that to work but this movie doesn't. She's the pretty girl but she's also the deluded, sociopath. Seriously! At the start of this movie, the character Tree is about as likable as the plant one. But Rothe portrayed this character undeniably well. Even in the latter half of the movie, she portrays the character exceptionally well and really sells the character's growth.

Another actor who appears in this movie was Israel Broussard. Broussard

also gives an excellent performance as Carter. Not only that, but I also REALLY buy the romance between Tree and Carter. It doesn't feel forced in the slightest and that is rare for a movie nowadays. It usually feels wrong when two characters get together in a movie because I just cannot see it happening in real life. But thankfully, I did buy their relationship, and found it to be a very fun and goofy one to watch.

Alas, I do definitely have some flaws with this movie. The final 15 minutes and the grand reveal were my two main issues. I won't spoil either of course, so you can still enjoy this film. But personally, I found the final 15 minutes of this movie to be COMPLETELY unnecessary. So much so that I was getting ready to leave at the climax of the scene before that because I thought the film was over. But no. They drag it on an extra 15 minutes and reveal what I predicted to happen. Which was my second issue. I predicted the ending BUT only because I was paying REALLY close attention to a scene and, while it may have been accidental, they reveal the ending by use of a prop. This may be just me being smart and interpreting it a weird way, or it may have been intentional, in which case then well done to those who were in charge of that. It was a very clever way to reveal it, and the people I saw this film with didn't catch on and I had to tell them about it afterwards. Despite that, I did figure it out so I can't really credit the reveal as being that good.

Something that personally didn't bother me but will bother other

people, is the fact that this is not a horror movie by definition. It has elements of horror movies, yes. But it is still technically a

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

comedy movie, which is NOT what the trailers suggested at all. So I can completely understand if horror fans felt misled, therefore I do think that they should've either completely changed the marketing campaign OR included a LOT more horror elements and creepy scenes.

But aside from those flaws, I found this to be a very enjoyable movie.

It isn't going to win any awards but I can see it gaining a cult following. It was certainly fun and entertaining and I will definitely recommend you go and see it. I'll rate Happy Death Day 6
& Creepy
Masks out of 10!

Rating: 117

6

Content: 117 , Size: 782

The premise of this film is what gives it 4 of the 6 stars I have given. It's actually a really smart plot, yet it is executed rather poorly, which is such a shame considering that if the film took itself a little more seriously, it could genuinely be put into contention as one of the great Psychological Thrillers of recent years. That is the problem, it's more fun than thrilling.

The story and ingenuity start to slow down as the film goes on, with both gently coming to a halt by the final 10 minutes of the film, so it's a downward slope from (pretty much) the start but it does manage to cling on to its entertainment value long enough to be worth watching.

Don't expect a masterpiece, it's just a bit of fun.

Rating: 118

10

Content: 118 , Size: 657

If you've seen Groundhog Day and Before I fall, then you should roughly know what the movie is about. The story-line is superb for it is a comedy and horror and whodunit movie all rolled into one. This is Jessica Rothe's second movie that I have seen, the Tribe being the other one. Yes I have not seen La La Land, because I hate musicals. Suffice to say Rothe is one of those actors who play their roles very convincingly. I am glad the test audience reacted furiously to the original ending of the movie and the director opted for the alternative ending. I enjoyed it therefore I recommend it. A nice change to typical Halloween season movies!

Rating: 119

10

Content: 119 , Size: 470

This movie has to be my favorite movie so far. The movie has a really great meaning to it, it's just like Groundhog Day and Scream in one

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

movie. This movie is scary, I loved the feel of the sound effects and stuff. The jump scares were great. After the movie I went home and I could not get to sleep, I actually woke up and thought it was the same day.

Overall the movie was the best movie I have ever seen yet.

If I could only rate 11/10.....

Rating: 120

8

Content: 120 , Size: 360

Went to movie theater with low expectations, but this movie surprised me!

I would not classify this movie as Horror/Mystery/Thriller, but as a Comedy with horror elements - it was funny, i liked all characters and plot twists.

I would definitely recommend watching it – film was executed very well and kept me entertained the whole time!

Rating: 121

6

Content: 121 , Size: 1803

Happy Death Day is a movie about a university student who, on her birthday, manages to get killed by an unknown masked person. After the experience, she wakes up and realizes that she is reliving said day. While she is repeating this process, she decides to begin tracking down the person who is repeatedly slaughtering her.

Now going into this movie I didn't really expect that much. A horror movie such as this one simply looked like one where jumpscars would be very common. To an extent, I was right; there were a lot of jumpscars in this film and only a couple were effective. The first one, for instance was effective because you couldn't see it coming, but they stopped being effective directly afterwards because I had an idea where the plot was going to go with every repeated day. In a way, the movie fails at being a horror due to its predictability. This movie also has some major plot holes that I would discuss, but that would dive into spoiler territory.

As for the stuff that I enjoyed in the film, it does get entertaining sometimes and many of the jokes were pretty funny. The relationships between the main character, the love interest and the dad eventually began to grow on me. If there's one thing that the movie somewhat succeeds in as a horror, it's the fact that it does deal with some of the repercussions of fear and what it can do to one's body and that's kind of scary when you think about it.

Overall I really did enjoy this movie when it felt more like a dramedy. However, when it turns back into a horror film, for the most part Happy Death Day turns into an ineffective horror movie that is intended on using predictable jumpscars as a means to scare people, leaving that aspect of the films very weak.

6/10

Rating: 122

7

Content: 122 , Size: 995

Movie with the time loop concept is interesting but really need many good elements in it. It must contain good story, morale message, and also the brilliant plot twist is a must. And what makes this movie great ? Yeah it because Happy Death Day has all of the important element. Simple story with popular girl in university, with good directing, the repeated scene because of time loop doesn't seem boring. They can make the audience to be curious and sometimes with extra comedy it makes this film really great !

No doubt you will like this horror thriller movie because it is not similar like usual horror movie with some ghost, devil, or mysterious phenomenon. Its more like thriller movie with mysterious psychopath that kills you and you just cant escape from it. Even if I think this movie is brilliant, I admit that with this film concept like this, I like better if the movie genre is drama because it can offer you much more emotional, dramatic, and better morale message.

Rating: 123

6

Content: 123 , Size: 4352

Groundhog Day had an arrogant man trapped in a small town on the same day until he learned to appreciate those around him. Edge of Tomorrow had Tom Cruise repeating an alien invasion until he could figure a way to win it. Today's movie has someone repeating not just their birthday, but the day that they are killed by a psychopath. I've mentioned before that on paper, time loop stories are a great way to get to know the person suffering the consequence of reliving the day. On camera, the trick is harder as the story has to remain consistent without being too repetitive.

The idea of someone having to repeat their birthday is an interesting one, considering that the older one gets, the less they care about the day that celebrates that. It may be a morose notion, but it's about the college age in which people would rather draw attention on the celebration rather than the number factor. I myself celebrated my thirtieth by taking a vacation and having dinner with the family. The movie not only gives us a character who could care less that she has a birthday, but an extra layer that I wont give away. So Happy Death Day may have a little extra for the time loop story.

A snobbish college girl Theresa (played by Jessica Rothe) wakes up in the dorm room of fellow student Carter (played by Israel Broussard). Though he tries to make small talk, she leaves to go back to her sorority. She spends the day being rude and pretentious to everyone including her roommate Lori. She's also the other girl in an affair

with her professor and even ignores her fathers invitation to a birthday lunch. On her way to a party, she is stalked by a hooded figure wearing her school's mascot image as a mask. She is killed…but wakes up the same morning…in the same dorm room of Carter.

She initially dismisses the previous night as a dream and goes on her day again…only to get killed. When she realizes she's repeating the same day over and over, she's suggested to use that time to follow potential suspects. Each day ends in death and summons her back to the beginning, but the twist is that with each day, she is growing weaker from the injuries. So despite the safety of the time loop, there seems to be a clock that is getting closer to midnight as Theresa is trying to solve her murder.

The whole time loop formula has been done before, but I like how Happy

Death Day has used it in a horror context. Did it generate a scary movie? Well… I'd say that while it's shot in a suspenseful tone, it doesn't generate that many scares. I'd argue that the tone is not even full horror, but I'll get to that in a moment. But going back to it's use on the time loop, I think they did it well. I also like that they establish that her body is still vulnerable to damage from the murders, otherwise it would seem like there were no consequence.

I'll say that I really enjoyed Jessica Rothe in the lead. For someone who initially has to start the film in an unlikable manner, she carries the story and really makes you want to see her redeem herself.

What the marketing seems to hide is that Happy Death Day is a part comedy. While I'm no sure why the trailers didn't want to spoil that notion, but I laughed more then I thought I was going. Because the film is still trying to be scary, it does suffer from inconsistency. I think it would have made sense to try and be a little more funny, something in the vein of Evil Dead or Drag Me to Hell. That would at least justify the PG-13 rating that is hindering this story of it's full potential. Those hoping for a lot of blood are not going to see it. I'll also bet that the film war originally produced with an R rating, only to get cut down to try and get in a teenage audience. Come on! Teenagers are already aware of these kinds of college dangers. They would have been fine with an R rating.

I'll give this six red birthday candles out of ten. Happy Death Day feels like a great movie that was edited by cowards who thought they knew what was best. I doubt ill see this again as it is, but I'll be on the lookout for a directors cut. Maybe that'll add back in that extra violence and jokes that are apparently too much for the studio

Rating: 124

10

Content: 124 , Size: 5709

Denis Villeneuve, you magnificent world wonder, you did it again!

I have seen this film three times in the cinema, in 3D, 2D and 4DX.

And one of the things i have noticed with this film, is that it's not

the time in the cinema that takes up my time, It's the hours upon hours in between spent thinking about the film, that is the real time consumer. This film left such a deep and profound impact, which i cannot escape. And I've gone back to the cinema twice to be tortured, but it's worth it.

It's a dark, mysterious, grim, hopeless, sad and lonely film, set in a possible near future where the human race is hanging by their fingertips on the edge of doom. So it's quite depressing. But it's so brilliantly put together, the closest master of cinema i think of that has done something similar, is Stanley Kubrick.

Many Stanley Kubrick films were also hated by many when they first released. 2001: A Space Odyssey for example, which had gorgeous visuals, but felt flat and hollow for many, even professional reviewers back then. But what Kubrick did best with his films, was to create afterthought. People left the cinema feeling confused and even depressed, but the movies planted a seed which then grew for years. The original Blade Runner also accomplished this. BR2049 is no exception, this movie will without doubt live on to be interpreted, analyzed and discussed for decades to come. The story continues from the original, but stands completely on it's own, it tells a new story that directly interlink with the original, but without trying to be a copy, it's a natural continuation in the same universe. You don't have to see the original Blade Runner first, though i do recommend it, see the final cut.

BR2049 has some of the most gorgeous visuals i have ever seen, and the cinematography is out of this world, there is literally no excuse not to give Roger Deakins the Oscar this time. After 13 nominations he has now knocked the ball out of the park and is this year in his own league entirely. It's confusing to look at something so gorgeous, whilst painting a picture of such a sad and lost world. It sort of collides with your senses, your eyes say it's beautiful, your mind say it's depressing. Which senses are you going to believe? What does it mean? At least don't confuse feeling depressed as a sign that this movie is bad, it's nothing wrong feeling depressed, take it in, embrace it. Then you will know how it feels to be a replicant that's trapped in a caged mind.

BR2049's story happens 30 years after the original, and there is three short films on Youtube i recommend you watch. These short films describes some of what happened in between 2019 and 2049. Watching them makes it slightly easier to understand some of the things going on. But the underlying theme is the same as it was in the original. What does it mean to be human? What does it mean to have memories? What is a soul? And so on.

The world has gone darker in 2049, climate is spinning out of control, almost all animals and plants have died. People are desperate and lost, law enforcement can barely keep anything together, and only a small spark can set of total disaster, which is looming just around every corner. Niander Wallace has taken over Tyrell Corp and has by the time

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

2049 takes place designed millions of obedient replicants that does exactly what he tells them to do. But there is one thing Wallace has not been able to perfect, and that's what the main story is all about, and Wallace will do anything in his power to get his hands on the technology, which will result in him becoming many hundred times richer and more powerful, the sole ruler of the entire universe. He is so far gone in his mind by 2049 he actually believes he is god himself, and he calls his replicants angels.

And of course he also uses replicants to do his dirty work;. In 2049 we meet his right hand girl; Luv (Brilliantly played by Sylvia Hoeks, if there is one actor in this movie that steal the show, it's her). Luv is a handygirl; so to speak, that perform whatever task she is set to do, with no remorse. Or is that entirely true? I can't spoil anything, but look closely at Luv's character arc. All the other actors also do an outstanding job in this film, no bad performances, but i can't talk about all of them due to the word limit in these reviews.

Be prepared going to see this film, it's depressing and heavy on your mind, and it demands your full attention. It's one of those rare films who dares to challenge the audience, and by doing so, taking a huge risk, and a 155 million dollar risk at that. The film isn't perfect, but it's close, and it shows the tremendous skills of Denis Villeneuve. And those few mistakes this movie have, are probably just happy little accidents as Rob Ross would have put it. This film is very much like a painting, every stroke of the brush matters, and every little detail is carefully crafted, it takes monumental skills to pull it off.

I loved this film, it's the best film I've seen all year, It is a must see, a monumental triumph of a film that's just as good (possibly even better) as the original and one of the best sequels of all time!

9.7/10 - Masterpiece

And BTW Villeneuve's next movie might be Dune, imagine if he brings Deakins and the rest of this team to make that movie. Yeah, I'm going to leave you with that thought. This is basically porn.

Rating: 125

10

Content: 125 , Size: 5405

Let me start by saying that I am a huge Denis Villeneuve fan and absolutely love every movie he made, from his breakthrough drama Incendies; to the action thriller Sicario;. But when I learned that he was going to make a sequel to Ridley Scott's iconic Blade Runner I had mixed feelings. Would he be able to live up to the expectations and make a sequel that could measure itself with the original? For this reason, I went into the cinema thinking ;This will be a great movie, I am a Villeneuve fan so I have to like it;; but that was a mistake, for once I stopped expecting and just started experiencing the film, I was enchanted by all of its visual beauty. I was wrong to doubt Villeneuve;

his 'Blade Runner 2049' even succeeds in transcending in some ways the original masterpiece, especially as a visual experience.

The bleak dystopian future Scott so perfectly created is even more beautiful in Villeneuve's 2049, for which a lot of credit has to be given to the brilliant director of photography Roger Deakins, who has made one of his best works (which says a lot). Every shot is brilliant, I loved every single frame and I cannot imagine that he wouldn't get nominated and win an Oscar for this phenomenal work. But also a big thumbs up has to be given to the entire effects team, for Deakins didn't do it all on his own.

Deakins isn't the only mastermind at work, for the score is also beautifully done. When I learned that composer Jóhann Jóhannsson (someone who has collaborated multiple times with Villeneuve and did most of the scores for his movies) got fired I was surprised; Jóhannsson has always delivered great work, but according to Villeneuve, his score ''wasn't the right one'' for this movie for it didn't ''resemble Vangelis soundtrack for Blade Runner'' quite enough. So he got replaced by probably the best man in the business nowadays; Hans Zimmer. And as we are used to with the German composer, this was once again sublime and a great homage to the original. Zimmer's 2049 score can be compared to his Dunkirk score, in a way that it unsettles us from the first chord and just as the Second World War movie, it keeps us on the edges of our seats, especially during the last hour.

As for the people who are actually situated in front of the camera, they all play their parts very well. I was especially happy that Ryan Gosling's agent K was indeed the leading man and he did a very good job. I was slightly concerned that it would mostly be about Harrison Ford's Deckard, but luckily that wasn't the case. Nevertheless, Ford gives one of his best performances in years and after all the iconic roles he played once again in recent years (Han Solo, Indiana Jones) this is by far the best. The smaller but important roles are also noteworthy; Robin Wright's Lieutenant Joshi makes a fierce and convincing police chief, while the villain duo Jared Leto's Neander Wallace as the evil head of a corporation at the top of the new world order and his frightening hit-woman Luv (Sylvia Hoeks) are also very impressive. Last but not least, Ana de Armas is also very good as Joi, K's girlfriend (even if she does remind me a lot of Scarlet Johansson in 'Her' and slightly of Alicia Vikander in 'Ex Machina';, but maybe that's something Villeneuve did that on purpose and wanted to pay homage to these recent but also very good science-fiction movies).

That said, Villeneuve will receive most of the credit, as he should. For unlike most of Hollywood's blockbusters nowadays, he doesn't simply deliver us a spectacle with some nice effects or a reboot of the original, but he picks up the threads where Scott left, which was a monumental task, for the original 'Blade Runner' is one of the most

impressive and iconic movies ever made. 2049 continues on the same topics raised by the original, making the sequel worth the 35-year long wait; it goes further with what was proposed in the first installment, enriching one another. It is possible that one day a third installment could be made, but that is only if any director will ever find the courage to make another 'Blade Runner';, for the bar is raised incredibly high. I believe that in time, 'Blade Runner 2049' will just as the original one, grow into a cult movie, and rightfully so, for it is its own movie, but, just as the original, a visually remarkable, achingly human sci-fi masterpiece.

I am not going to say more about it, because the studio has been unusually insistent in its pleas to critics and the first movie viewers not to reveal any plot points, but I am glad they did. Even if I could go on and on about the movie and the difference between replicants and humans (or is there really much of a difference, after all?) the less you know the better, because 2049 feels at its best when it surprises (which is one of Villeneuve's greatest strengths). This is a movie best experienced on the biggest screen in your cinema; trust me, it will be worth your while. As for me, I will most likely try and make some free time in my schedule for the coming days, 'cause I want to go the cinema again, guess what I'm gonna watch...

Rating: 126

10

Content: 126 , Size: 4039

For film fanatics like myself, Blade Runner 2049 is a great film for people to see, regardless if they've witnessed the original or not. On the other hand, if you've never seen the original Blade Runner and are just a casual moviegoer that have thought of the promotion for this film as being an action-packed thrill ride, then I'd have to warn to stay far away from this near three hour motion picture. It's very hard to review this film without getting into specific plot details, but that's exactly what makes this film worth the price of admission alone. For nearly every reason a film fan should be excited about a movie, here is why Blade Runner 2049 is a must see as soon as possible.

Before dropping you into this world with Ryan Gosling's character, there is text at the beginning that will fill you in on the history of the events in the past, but even though that information is given to you, your experience just won't be the same without having viewed the first film multiple times and remembering the emotional core of it. Set out on a mission to find something of meaning to the overall story, Ryan Gosling's character (who will remain nameless for the sake of this review) uncovers mysteries and secrets from the past, inevitably involving Rick Deckard. Quite honestly, that's the plot in a nutshell and the specifics of the film will lead to ruining your experience, so let's get technical.

If not for anything else, Blade Runner 2049 benefits from some of the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

best cinematography I've laid my eyes on in years. From the addition of the seamlessly blended visual effects, to the mind- blowing scenery constructed by the entire art department, I have nothing but praise for this film. Whether or not you find yourself enjoying your experience, the visuals alone should have you applauding, due to their incredibly detailed nature. I personally found the overall film to be magnificent, but when certain scenes were dialogue-free and asking you to gasp at the imagery, that's exactly what I was doing, as I feel many audiences members will.

Again, without giving anything away, once Rick Deckard (Harrison Ford)

enters the picture, the way both films sort of interconnect was brilliant in my opinion. It does justice to any loose ends that fans may have wanted in the past, as well as create a new story to gawk at in the process. With a terrifically restrained performance by Ryan Gosling, you'll find yourself sucked into this world as a fly on the wall, as he uncovers these mysteries. With the addition of Harrison Ford giving one of his most sincere and memorable performances, as well as Ana de Armas in a role that really took me by surprise, this film was casted to the nines from beginning to end. Some may complain about Jared Leto and Dave Bautista not being included as much, but I felt as though they served the story quite nicely.

In the end, this movie aims to impress Sci-Fi fans across the world, but I feel as though the people who will be looking back on this as a possible classic or at least one of the best sequels ever made, are those who've had the pleasure of indulging in the greatness that is 1982's Blade Runner. I don't say this about films very often, especially when talking about sequels, but I haven't been this immersed in a theatrical experience in quite some time. This is definitely a superior film than the original, it's one of the best films of 2017, and I'll be revisiting it very soon. Blade Runner 2049 is getting a lot of praise and awards consideration from critics and filmgoers across the world, and every bit of it is deserved. Aside from being very long, this is pretty much a perfect film if you don't try to nitpick how it connects and certain questions that aren't blatantly answered. If you know what type of film you're in for, or you've at least seen the original and enjoyed it, I can't recommend this movie enough.

Rating: 127

10

Content: 127 , Size: 1599

Blade Runner 2049 is the sequel to the 1982 sci-fi classic Blade Runner. Directed by Denis Villeneuve (Arrival, Sicario) and once again based on Philip K. Dick's novel Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?, it successfully recaptures just about everything excellent about the original and is a superb sequel to one of the greatest and most important science fiction films of all time.

Thirty years after the events of the first film, LAPD Officer K (Ryan

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Gosling) works as a Blade Runner, retiring old rogue replicants (artificial humans) hiding out around the Los Angeles area. One day while on a job, K discovers a long buried secret in the yard of a replicant which leads him on a journey to track down former Blade Runner Rick Deckard (Harrison Ford), who has been missing for decades.

Featuring amazing visuals and some of the most philosophical and thought-provoking themes since the original, Blade Runner 2049 is a masterpiece of science fiction and is possibly one of the greatest sequels ever made. I was transfixed the entire time, to the point where I felt that even blinking would cause me to miss something I wanted to see. The cast was brilliant as well, especially Ryan Gosling, who does a fantastic job carrying the film as its lead actor. However, perhaps best of all, is that seeing the original is not a requirement to fully understand everything that is going on, although it would probably still help to have done so beforehand. I'm almost certain that author Philip K. Dick would be proud of this film. I know I am.

I rate it a very high 9.5/10

Rating: 128

3

Content: 128 , Size: 4762

I never was one of those people asking for a Blade Runner sequel. Now that Blade Runner 2049 is out, my position still stands. This film is simply a massive letdown and nothing more.

The year is 2049 and the world has grown in technology, but not humanity. Ryan Gosling plays K, a Blade Runner (a futuristic cop) tasked with tracking down the last of the Replicants-androids that look like humans. Knowing that he himself is a replicant, he goes on a journey of his own when he finds a box containing the bones of a Replicant who gave birth to a child and is tasked with finding the child. Little does he know that the new head of the Tyrell Corporation that makes the Replicants, Mr. Wallace (Jared Leto), plans to use the missing child for his own purposes and kill K if he has to.

My main problem with the film is that it was unforgivably boring. The film is two hours and forty-five minutes long, which is already enough to test one's patience (and bladder), but it feels so deliberately paced; the characters almost always move so slow, that it feels like the filmmakers thought that it was the best way to pad out the running time, despite having not enough material to justify it.

The performances range from great to laughable. Harrison Ford is hardly in the movie, and his inclusion is clearly a marketing ploy, but he gives the best performance in his brief running time and he feels like a continuation of his character from the original, Deckard, in a world where things have just gotten worse. Gosling isn't bad as K, and his stone-face actually is pretty effective in a couple of scenes, but Rutger Hauer in the original gave his Replicant character more of a personality. Leto is trying and failing to bring a degree of menace as

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

the villain, and his female Replicant sidekick competes with him in the field of phoning it in.

What else shocked me was how unsubtle the film was. The original was

not only a futuristic crime noir that had Harrison Ford's Deckard chasing down androids, but also a personal journey involving himself and Rutger Hauer as the villain that involved trying to find a degree of humanity in such a futuristic world, and that maybe, Deckard is a replicant himself. Here, the story is mainly of Gosling trying to come to terms with the fact that he is a Replicant and what it means in terms of his humanity. Whereas in the original, there were subtle signs, images, and bits of dialogue that hinted at Deckard's purpose in the original, everything is spelled out for the audience to the point that old bits of dialogue are repeated thrice at important moments. It doesn't respect the audience's intelligence at all. The first and final thirds of the film are mainly filled with dialogue that is basically speeches that preach ideas about conflict and the ethics of machines, but hardly any of it is explored in an interesting fashion. What's worse, the film feels so empty and devoid that for a time, I forgot what K's objective was.

What I will say is that the cinematography is beautiful. There are a

lot of colorful images with ancient ruins and futuristic tech in the background and foreground that could easily pass as being part of an art gallery. The only downside is that there is too much gray in some shots and it feels too clean compared to the original.

Why Warner Brothers and Sony wasted their time making this film, I have no clue. Maybe it was Ridley Scott's fault. After being unimpressed with his Alien: Covenant earlier this year (and was also quite the snooze-fest), watching this only proved to me further that Scott just doesn't care about good filmmaking anymore. Denis Villeneuve is clearly an ambitious director, but his style didn't feel completely right for this film. Clearly, in a film that tries so desperately to say much more humanity than its predecessor, it comes out feeling empty and feels less human than the original did.

P.S. A lot of people have accused me of being too shallow and wanting this film to be more action packed. I do not have that mindset. I enjoy films that take their time as much as the next film enthusiast, but this one just didn't do enough to justify what it was aiming for. I'm not ashamed in expressing my opinion. Just let me be clear on something: going at a slow, deliberate pace and speaking lines of preachy dialogue does not, I repeat, does not equal intelligence. The positive reviews baffle me, especially on Rotten Tomatoes. Sony owns the company, which leads me to think that maybe it bribed more than a few critics in the hopes that more people would see it. Clearly, that is backfiring and I'm happy that people are rejecting it.

Rating: 129

3

Content: 129 , Size: 6420

In 1982 I was deeply excited about the prospect of seeing "Blade Runner," and can remember applying for a chance to see an advance showing in Sacramento. From the start it seemed obvious that it was a special film--clouded in controversy and mystery. Later I acquired my much-viewed VHS copy, with all the eye-gouging, nail-puncturing violence. Later still the Internet provided background information as, eventually, did articles plus a comprehensive book by Paul M. Sammon. In short, I am a fan, and was eagerly anticipating the sequel.

So, it was with disappointment that I left an October 6, 2017 showing "Blade Runner 2049." Overly long, boring, poorly paced, and confusing were my initial impressions, though admittedly it was beautifully filmed (potential Oscar nomination in cinematography?).

I appreciated the many (too many?) subtle and not-so-subtle nods to the original film, the effort to build on the "Blade Runner" universe, and efforts by writers, directors, and actors to bring the story to life. But there were just too many scenes that should have been reduced in length from 25-50% of their run time. Such excess in a film is, to me, almost always a fatal flaw. And some scenes (e.g., where characters "Joi" and "Mariette" merge to make love to "K") could have been cut altogether, I feel, without harming the story.

The acting was satisfactory or better, for the most part, as one would expect from the level of supporting talent.* However, I have knowingly seen two pictures starring Ryan Gosling—2016's "La La Land" and now this—and in both he is bland and wooden. Despite the fact that "2049's" "K" is SUPPOSED to be a self-controlled, artificial humanoid, I wonder if it is just Gosling's natural on- (and off-) screen persona. And frankly, Harrison Ford's "Deckard" just did not work for me. Sacrilegious, I know; but true. I blame this on two factors.

First, Ford appears (too) late in the movie, by which time I was already exhausted by tedium. Second, for a character without appearance-changing makeup, a dramatic accent, say, or pronounced behavioral distinctions, it is hard not to just see Harrison Ford. (Kind of like Robert Redford miscast in 1985's "Out of Africa.") Oh, it's (old) Harrison Ford again. Sorry HF fans everywhere.

And another thing; due to poor direction, they included "Admiral William Adama" (Edward James Olmos) from TV's "Battlestar Galactica," and not "Gaff" (also Olmos), in a too brief cameo. (Listen to "Gaff" in the 1982 original. Totally different voicing.)

Like most films, it suffered from its share of "Oh, come on!" moments. Why would 6-foot "K" allow 6-foot-6 Dave Bautista's imposing "Sapper Morton" to make the first move (and thus begin the accumulation of a

ridiculous amount of damage, most of it unnecessary, sustained by K" throughout the story)? Because that's what movie detectives do. I must say, K" apparently likes to pass violently through solid walls (a nod to Rutger Hauer's "Roy Batty" head in the original, I take it).

Almost all action-adventure films are silly in hindsight and full of movie plot clichés—"Blade Runner 2014" is no exception. But the test

of a good movie is whether the story flows at a pace that makes audiences subconsciously accept and even relish these otherwise nonsensical encumbrances (see 1999's "The Matrix"). For my part I was less inclined to give "2049" a pass on the silliness due to its plodding nature.

Ridley Scott is prominently associated with both the recent "Alien" and

Blade Runner" franchises, and has promised multiple sequels. Do we want this? Is state-of-the-art movie-making worth either ridiculously poor stories (the "Alien" franchise) or bad plotting and editing ("Blade Runner 2049")? It's admittedly hard to make a good movie, but Scott and his people are paid a LOT of money to do so. Check Scott's IMDb filmography. Can any mortal be involved first-hand in that many projects? As with Stephen King, maybe it's time to stop the quantity and re-focus on the quality? Just saying…

In conclusion, my disappointment focused primarily on the script and

editing.**

Some recommendations to potential viewers: First, if you plan to see

"Blade Runner 2049" it will help to see one of 37 versions (e.g., voice-over or no voice-over?; graphic violence shots or not?) of the original 1982 film beforehand. Second, maybe wait to watch the movie digitally, so that you can re-play key scenes and increase volume on important dialogue. In the theater I kept mentally reaching for a non-existent remote control. Third, (after Recommendation One) if like me you hold the original picture in deep admiration as a flawed but intriguing analog masterpiece of SF movie-making, consider skipping this sequel altogether. But I imagine that warning will fall on deaf ears.

* Because of the look and feel of two female characters in the film, I

wonder if actresses Felicity Jones ("Rogue One") and Tatiana Maslany ("Orphan Black") were originally considered for the parts eventually played by Ana de Armas (companion hologram "Joi") and Sylvia Hoeks (deadly replicant "Luv"). While watching the trailer footage, I originally mistook those two characters for actresses Jones and Maslany. Their doppelgangers did just fine, though. Hoeks' "Luv" is particularly chilling.

** Oh, and the music! Not so good. Too often I was aware of background

music--that by itself is not a good thing--and its shortcomings. So much so that by the end of "2049," where original "Blade Runner" music

("Tears in the Rain," I think) is (finally) used, it left me with mixed feelings. First, thank god! Second, where was that musical excellence

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

during the rest of the film? Music can make or break a film, and is incredibly important. Few excellent films have poor musical soundtracks. Unfortunately, "Blade Runner 2049" is not an exception to that guideline.

Rating: 130

5

Content: 130 , Size: 980

...the return of the giant Atari sign from the original Blade Runner.

OK, quick story synopsis. Bones found of a Replicant who's given birth. How was it possible and where is the child (now adult)?

I'm sorry, but having waited 35 years for this movie it just didn't press any buttons for me. It's an hour too long, the story-line is weak to non-existent and doesn't get answered, the theory of Deckard's origin is again teased at but not answered (even though there really is very little in the original to point to him being a replicant).

This is another SFX over substance movie. Looks good, although very dark in the 3D version, but there just doesn't seem to be the energy and edginess of the original. It all seems too NICE.

Having seen the original movie over 30 times, I'm not sure I'll bother returning to this new story. I have to agree with Rutger Hauer about trying to add to a perfect movie.

Rating: 131

3

Content: 131 , Size: 1079

The first movie (which should have stayed the only movie) is a masterpiece of sci fi. I was hooked from the start great story and for the time great FX also cannot beat the soundtrack by Vangelis.

Not sure what is going on with Ridley Scott first with is Alien Covenant he destroyed the series there and now with the new addition of blade runner.

I feel that all the positive reviews for this movie are fake, because the movie is a sad excuse to make money and makes no sense at all, no surprised it failed this weekend at the box office.

The acting is good so are the special effects, but the story is weak and none existent, Tyrell corporation is gone and there is a new company that makes the replicans, and tyrell had found a way for them to reproduce and have babies.

This is where the story gets weird, Deckard is brought back into the mix because he had a child with Rachel.

The movie also lack action and in the end does not explain anything. I felt like a huge waste of 2h and a half.

35y in the making for this wow just wow.

Rating: 132

1

Content: 132 , Size: 1878

The original Blade Runner is one of my favourite films so I was really looking forward to this one. What a disappointment. If I wasn't in the company of others I would of walked out early. I left the cinema feeling annoyed that I had to sit through this overlong monotonous film. The storyline is dragged out with the main character just going from place to place to investigate something like in a video game. At the beginning he is in a fight scene and you find out he is basically indestructible. The replicants are now terminators. This leaves out any suspense that he is in danger. The first film was kind of believable, the city was overcrowded and the buildings were decaying - it had atmosphere. This one looked like a more modern city with a lot of emptiness. The technology has advanced so much that he now has a solid light fully realistic AI holographic companion that operates from a small device he can keep in his pocket. If you think about it why are they so desperate to increase replicant slave labour production when they are capable of building AI robots that can be enveloped with holographic light to look human. They still have the blurry 1950 TV quality monitors to echo the first film but the supposed technology jump does not make sense. The music by Vangelis was one of the most important parts of the original. He conveyed through the use of synthesisers and traditional instruments a sense of awe and wonder, beauty and the sadness of a dystopian world. Johann Johannsson was originally commissioned to score the film and I think he would of done a great job but they decided for some reason it was not Hollywood sounding enough so they bought in Hans Zimmer. What a disaster. It might as well be the music from Batman VS Alien. Just lots of loud noise. The original was a box office failure that became a cult classic. This is just a failure.

Rating: 133

2

Content: 133 , Size: 2618

SPOILERS ALERT: The biggest difference between 1982 masterpiece and this one is that in the first film everything is happening at a normal speed. In original movie people talk like they talk in real life, their move at perfectly normal, every day, common speed, it doesn't take them forever to finish the sentence, or to shape out a thought, and yet... somehow it all works perfectly together.

There's no way to know how will people (let alone robots) act or talk in thirty plus years, but if it is to be anything like in BR2049, I suspect it will be a pretty bleak and exhausting world.

From the moment one, everybody talks, walks, plays, runs in some super-strange slow-mo: I'd say at 50% of the normal speed. It takes 10 seconds for poor Ryan Gosling only to take out something from his

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

pocket. Not to say how long it takes him to walk through the scene - so much that half way through, let's say, the orphanage part, I have already forgotten what is he doing there in the first place.

20 minutes into the movie, all I'm doing is wondering when this shot is going to end, when this scene is going to end, when the sequence will, and, ultimately, when the movie is going to end. This is not the way to pay a homage, to anybody or anything.

There is a reason why the shots in "2001 Odyssey..." are that long, somebody should've warned the director about that. And there's also a reason why all shots in the original BR are that tight. And that's just one of the reasons to why both 2001 and BR are masterpieces. And for that same reason, BR2049 could that never be.

You don't drag out every single aspect of the movie just to make it seem serious or pretend to be an artist, no. If you do, you get very expensive, anemic boredom. I have no idea why the director did it - he hasn't done it in that fairly fair movie with Hugh Jackman. What possessed him to do it here? Was it the importance of the first movie? Was it his fear to look like a schoolboy in front of the Master? Don't know, don't care.

What a waste of great actors, class all - forcing them to engage in some sort of quasi elevated, quasi profound, but genuinely bizarre ballet that has nothing, nothing, nothing to do with the real life. The movie is three hours plus long only for the given reason - it would have been an hour shorter if had played out at normal pace.

Oh - and to end here - the biggest dread of all: a hint of a possible franchise. Please, please, please people, for the love of all that's holly. Don't.

Rating: 134

5

Content: 134 , Size: 5291

Please be aware that my review contains spoilers so please do not read further if you do want to have key plot points revealed.

First things first, I'm a big fan of the original and have enjoyed immensely with each viewing, first from when I was a 10 year old until 2 weeks ago so I was interested to see what Villeneuve would do with the sequel.

Watched it Saturday and must say the experience left me somewhat underwhelmed and frustrated at seeing such an opportunity to do something original go to waste, that I have decided to post my thoughts here on IMDb for the first time.

In no particular here are some of my questions and general points about the film.

Jared Leto's performance. How the hell is he such a high paid star? I cannot think of anything he is particularly memorable and this is no exception.

His eyes. Are they distracting on purpose?

If his character saved the world from starvation, how come there aren't millions of people worshiping him? Humans are suckers for finding idols

and why shouldn't his character be any different. Crikey, we have dictators in our world who had days and months of the year named after family members.

Why doesn't he have a massive army organised to hunt down Deckard instead of entrusting this to one replicant and a few goons?

Monologues giving exposition is lazy storytelling and old Wallace loves a monologue.

What is his plan? He wants to produce more replicants but kills one at the start for some spurious reason. Hint hint, to show the audience he is a very naughty. He also has the Rachel replicant killed. No wonder he cannot make enough replicants if he keeps killing them.

Ryan Gosling plays Ryan Gosling again and although I don't dislike his performances, I find it hard to root for his character here, as I've seen it before in a much better film (Drive).

The music wasn't particularly memorable and only made me think of the much better soundtrack from Bladerunner. Apparently this was intentional on Villeneuve's part as he removed the original composer who wanted to do something original. So instead, the director opted for Zimmer to make it more Bladerunnery and therefore less memorable for this film.

The film did not merit or need the run-time it had. I appreciate the original BR took its time but it had a new world to show us

The ending was goofy and ridiculous. Why would K bring Deckard to his daughter who is the most wanted person in the history of want people? This will definitely endanger her given that Leto's character has a relationship with her and probably has her under some sort of surveillance.

Hero comes back from the dead to say the day click; at end was extremely predictable and had me rolling my eyes, which I shouldn't be doing the first time I watch a film.

The blackout sounds like a much more interesting story than this. Caused by replicants? A solar flare? Was there a Trump two term presidency in this universe?

Robots reproducing and creating their own has already been cover in Battlestar Galactica, who did it in a more compelling fashion with characters and stakes I cared about

Plus, how come Leto's character hasn't figured out on to get replicants to reproduce? Why can't he produce them faster? How many has he killed before delivering a monologue

Some of the visuals are stunning though lack depth or colour. The future looks fairly boring in comparison to Bladerunner 1982, which offered some very unusual street shots and characters. One included a guy with a eagle on his head. Nothing to really catch the eye in BR2049.

Why not have Rachel as leader of the rebellion instead of some random person the audience has no connection with.

When the capture Deckard, why on earth wouldn't they kill K?

How did K know how to find the car with Dekkard at the end? We don't

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

see him doing any investigative work to discover this information, despite the long run time.

They made a replicant clone of Rachel but get the eye colour wrong? Seriously?

How heavy handed was the prejudice? No subtlety whatsoever. Jeepers, you spend all that money on effects but then go minimum wage on screen writers.

That sex scene reminded me of Ghost with all the syncing going on. Watching Whoopi do her thing was just as sexy as watching this scene, despite it having two incredibly attractive women present, along with Ryan Gosling who is no slouch himself in the looks department.

The replicant rebellion feels shoehorned in rather than something which has grown and developed organically. Need to take lessons from Star Wars on how to introduce a rebel alliance story.

The golden rule of cinema is broken here when they show/play clips from a much better film.

Critics are only offering gushing praise for a film with considerable flaws because they don't wish to get caught out like the critics of 82. Back then, the critics hated it because they couldn't see the hidden depth, this time they see depth that simply isn't there. Even one of the character says something along these lines to another.

Rating: 135

1

Content: 135 , Size: 2640

BR2049 has more plot holes than emmental cheese and one big "plot twist" that I won't mention, not because it would spoil much, but because if you decide to watch this movie, you deserve to be disappointed by its stupidity.

The big "twist" is mentioned as the "miracle", but it is absolutely idiotic and illogical from the point of view of a manufacturer of replicants. How did "that" might have ever be considered a good idea? One would assume that after the disaster of the Nexus 6 series, Tyrell Co. and his successors would have invented some more reliable security system - such as a lower level of self-consciousness, way safer than the questionable "obedience" of the Nexus 8. Or even something like all the androids looking the same, so that they can be easily detected and you would not need blade runners to locate and eliminate them.

Anything that would provide humanity with useful, free labor without ethical problems… But no, in this movie ethical problems just got exponentially bigger. And so much for a science so advanced as to reproduce perfect bodies and minds...

Besides, since it is established that humankind sucks, I failed to understand how replicants are in any way better, since they just want to be more "like humans";….

On the visual side, BR2049 sucks, too. Looks like they used random leftovers scenery from other Sc-Fi/disaster movies, from the overused industrial background of Terminator to the deserts blurred landscape

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

of MadMax and the inevitable nightmarish city-scape, which looks like Blade Runner, but on cheap side. Costumes looks like the contemporary drab clothing promoted by Nordic high street chains: lots of dark, cheap-looking leggings and stretchy tops, a far cry from the decadent, elaborate futuristic/retro suits of BR.

In one scene, Deckard meets Tyrell's successor in a closed room filled with water, except a square island in the middle. A room that has no other reason to exist except bringing back memories of the original Tyrell building.

The dialog is unbelievable bad and scenes drag on forever. When the Goslin character finds Deckard, the two spend over ten minutes fighting and chasing each other, when a couple of lines of dialogue would have avoided that.

The ending is both manipulative and plagiarist: it wants to move the audience, recreating the amazing poetic moment of Roy Batty's death, but using snow instead of rain. If nothing else, the ending would have been enough to put me off this piece of commercial garbage.

Rating: 136

8

Content: 136 , Size: 4453

I've only seen the original Blade Runner once and it was a long time ago. I liked it but I just haven't got around to revisiting it. I mention this because even though I'm not a die-hard fan of Blade Runner, I still found the plot of 2049 engrossing. It's a well put together mystery, I found that they constantly took the plot in unexpected directions and other than the trailer spoiling the return of Deckard, I was always excited about what was going to happen next. The movie pulls an excellent bait and switch at the end that really surprised me. They made the right decision to not repeat the formula of the first one and take the story to a new place. They also create some compelling subplots which is something that few movies get right.

The biggest star of this movie is the cinematography and the excellent work of Roger Deakins. The original was noteworthy with the special environment that Ridley Scott and his creative team brought to the screen. That was continued here if not improved upon. The look of L.A. in 2049 they decided to go with isn't completely distinct but it was a little more understated (I'd compare it to the 2017 Ghost in the Shell but less fantastical). My favourite scene might have been a shootout in a defunct club where the lighting and the background show are turning on and off. I don't hesitate to praise when a movie looks good but this is an exemplary example of using visuals and atmosphere to help build on a strong story.

Blade Runner 2049 returns very few of the characters from the original film but they manage to breathe life into this movie through the new ones they created. Officer K isn't the most lively protagonist but he gets an eye-opening character arc that kept me involved. Deckard

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

doesn't appear till later in the movie but he remains interesting and what they decide to do with him makes his appearance worthwhile. I also really liked some of the smaller supporting characters. Sapper really helps kick off the movie, what Joi represents is extremely emotional and Mariette is so mysterious that her involvement brings up more and more questions. Add in that Niander Wallace and Luv make for pretty menacing villains and you have a pretty well-rounded and fascinating script.

I don't think that the actors/actresses will be the focal point of the

awards attention that this movie will get but that doesn't mean there aren't exemplary performances. Gosling is good as K, he's deliberately robotic and he accomplishes a lot through his subtlety. Harrison Ford isn't in the movie as much as I wanted him to be (he's still one of my all-time favourite actors) but he holds up his end. He works with Gosling well and they have a solid rapport. Surprisingly, I really liked Sylvia Hoeks. She stole a lot of her scenes and I thought she was great even acting against a stacked cast. Dave Bautista showed he has a lot more range than people give him credit for. Jared Leto is in a very Jared Leto role (deliberately weird and hard to understand) but he does it well and although he might be a little creepy, the guy is still a great actor. I also want to credit Ana de Armas, she was distinctly warm and she showed a lot more emotion than I had seen from her previously.

There were points in this movie I could have rated this a 9/10 but some

small things that I had to dock the movie for. Even with a compelling story, the movie has such a long run time that it couldn't help but drag. There are certain scenes where the movie wants you to really drink in the environment but they could have edited it a little tighter. They also couldn't help but lose me at points through how much artistic flair they utilize. Villeneuve is an authority in this area and while I appreciate an artistic approach to this science fiction tale, for me they overdid it a little.

I was surprised how much I ended up liking Blade Runner 2049. I think

if you're a big fan of the original, you'll love this to bits. This is successful in bringing in the uninitiated but I think fans will enjoy this even more. I haven't been on board for all of Villeneuve's films but this is a good combination of his artistic style with enough of a commercial element for the masses. I'd give this somewhere between an 8-9 but with the extremely long run time, I'll give this an 8/10.

Rating: 137

8

Content: 137 , Size: 2572

So, I didn't expect much from this sequel when it was announced, but since the original Blade Runner is, in my opinion, one of the greatest movies ever made (if not the greatest), I had to see it anyways. As I often do, I didn't read any reviews or watch any trailers

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

before going.

So, where do we start... While not perfect, and inferior to the original, this is still a great movie. Visually it's simply stunning and the actors are all excellent. Just as importantly, or maybe even more so, like the original it combines a slow pace and fantastic ambiance to create an introspective mood and invite reflection on some important themes and issues of our time. (although, maybe, lacking a dialogue with the same power as the Roy Batty monologue at the end of the first movie).

As some negative reviewers said, it is slow..... but that works well

with the story and its intent to create a very clear, pervasive mood rather than to dazzle with dumb car chases, gunfights, or explosions, not to mention pushing the viewer to form his own opinions. The boring part is subjective: for viewers who like to be challenged intellectually I'd say many action movies are a lot more boring. Nothing wrong with escapist movies, which I also enjoy when I'm in the right mood, but it doesn't change the fact that they're inherently much more predictable, superficial and formulaic. In other words, entertaining but intellectually boring.

Regarding Blade Runner 2049, one disappointment, though, to be honest, was the soundtrack: aside from being too loud, it really consists mostly of weird sounds/noises etc. While they do heighten the mood at times, or fit the atmosphere, they are not really not up to the lofty standards of the photography, the action, or the direction.

Also, the plot could have been a little tighter, and while the slow pace is what this movie needed, I'm not convinced it really had to be this long (or to touch on so many themes, as it does).

Still, it's a fantastic, and unique, viewing experience, and even with its imperfections it does create a believable (if gloomy and depressing) dystopian vision of the future, and touches on themes that could spark endless debate and reflection. And herein lies its beauty: shallow popcorn movies will have faded from everybody's memory in weeks. A movie like Blade Runner 2049 will inspire us and challenge us, whether we agree with some of its vision or not, maybe even whether we love it or hate it, for years to come.

Rating: 138

1

Content: 138 , Size: 1608

I always gave the original Blade Runner 10/10. Seen it a over a 1000 times including at the movie theater. Good pace, visuals, music, likable characters, bad guys. Yup, pretty much everything. One of my top 10 movies of all time. This review for 2049 is not because it should be the same thing or make it over the top.

OK now this Blade Runner 2049. Bad boring. Where nothing really means much. Unlikable characters, music is meh; nothing unique (A poor version of the original). Bad people in this, who cares? Bring us back with someone who is actually a threat (like Roy). We have some stupid

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

terminator woman who really just flat out sucks. Poor casting. Jared Leto sucks. Yeah, he really does. Then you have the black guy with a cane from walking dead, who talks to everyone sideways. Who talks to people sideways? Why did you cast him? I've never see someone in any other movie, show or real life talk to people when they are not looking at them. Fail!!! I thought it was stupid in walking dead and now its really stupid. Plot is blah. Oh, it's also like a journey for Ryan Gosling to go from one Cameo to another with another boring scene. Not much vocab, emotion. Even Roy in the original had TONS of emotion and even had poetry at the end when he decided to turn a corner and save life instead of destroying everything in his path.

Harrison Ford is just an old man in this(sorry to say). Think it's time to retire. Did nothing in this film except hold a gun in Ryan's face and get captured with handcuffs.

Do not believe the hype, not a good movie.

Rating: 139

6

Content: 139 , Size: 694

What a disappointment, so much hype and, therefore, expectation but this is no more than a competent sci-fi film, certainly not a worthy successor to the original. I could support a 163 minute run time if there was plenty of content but at times it felt like the actors were moving and speaking slowly not for effect, but to fill in the gaps. As for the plot, everything revolved around the ability or otherwise of replicants to breed. If you have the technology to grow a human body from scratch and implant whatever memories you want I'd have thought introducing the mechanics of reproduction wouldn't be difficult. I could go on but really, this film isn't worth the bother.

Rating: 140

1

Content: 140 , Size: 866

i cannot believe these ten star comments, first the visuals were mostly flat, there was no explanation why in this time there were virtually no people around, one scene only with about thirty extras, no lights seems to be on either in the shots were he is flying over the city. more importantly you had a very thin plot that could have been told in less than an hour. nothing happens for most of the film. it is as if all concerned were on valium. the music was just noise. talk about an anti-climatic ending, the film just whimpers out. none of the very little plot made any sense. so here we have yet again critics raving about nothing. an insult to the original in every way. do not waste your time or money going to see this. i was going to list the many non-sensical things in the film but on reflection i don't think the film deserves anymore of my time

Rating: 141

9

Content: 141 , Size: 2073

Similar responses to the original Bladerunner when it came out in 1982 (when feel-good hit ET was in theaters) and how people didn't know what to make of the then bleak, slow-paced Sci-Fi film. This is not unlike introducing Guardians of the Galaxy fans to 2049 today, an even darker, longer journey into the same Sci-Fi world. I can understand why some people might not like it, mostly due to attention spans and needing more explosions and violence with hyper-editing and a groovy soundtrack. This is not a knock on those movies, this is just a different genre. And just like the original, not everybody gets it or truly appreciates what has been accomplished here. This is a BIG movie, with a mystery that leaves you thinking and knowing that no matter what your first opinion is, a second viewing is required to even begin grasping everything you just saw. And not everybody wants to do that because they don't want to be challenged. They want the eye-candy action, a foot-tapping soundtrack and a vegetable soup ending spelled out for them (in 2 hours or less). So no, this movie is not for them.

However, if you're a fan of the original Bladerunner and that particular dystopian world, this movie takes it to another level. After seeing the original film, I remembering wondering what the world outside of the dark LA nights in 2019 would be like? And that is just one of the ways 2049 has expanded that notion, leaving an open door to an even bigger world with deeper questions beyond it. Yes it is a long and relatively slow paced movie (by design), and so was 'Once Upon a Time in the West'. And yet just like that movie as well as the original Bladerunner, over time, this too will get more and more appreciation with age (and wisdom) for those who truly appreciate the art of film-making. It's not perfect, no movie ever will ever to everybody will it? But it is an amazing achievement and I look forward to my next viewing with different eyes, taking in what I may have missed because there is so much to see and overlook.

Rating: 142

3

Content: 142 , Size: 3525

Blade Runner is one of my favorite films of all time for a number of reasons:

1) Amazing groundbreaking trailblazing visuals that spawned an entire genre (aka 'cyberpunk').

2) Superb music by Vangelis that is integral to the film.

3) Great characters and amazing acting.

4) Underlying philosophical themes of corporate oppression (Blade Runner is just a small cog in a huge machine just carrying on with his life doing the job because otherwise he's reduced to nothing), existentialism (what it means to be human) coupled with Biblical

references presented in a subtle way.

5) Amazing practical special effects that make the world around the characters feel lived-in.

6) Meticulous attention to detail, lighting in particular.

While "2049" is nothing more than a mere attempt at recreating something in the style of the original by a studio committee ticking off the items in the checklist. The result is abysmal because it does not introduce something new in terms of visual design, interesting characters, music or story. On the contrary it tries so hard to tie itself to the original it's sickening. Call it fan-service or pandering, either way it leads to the movie being a highly derivative product that exists solely because of the original.

1) Plot lines that go against the premise of the original (Nexus 6 being able to reproduce, new Nexus 8 being easily distinguishable from humans) are stupid.

2) Acting is horrendous. Ana "Pouty lips" De Armas couldn't hold a candle to Sean Young not to mention the pretentious for pretentiousness sake Jared Leto. Ford is here for a paycheck and Gosling is deliberately one-note.

3) The music is a lame attempt at copying Vangelis' beautiful score.

4) Too varying visuals leave you with this feeling of an inconsistent world that doesn't follow the idea of polluted lifeless post-industrial world where the sun doesn't shine, it's constantly raining and the only light outside the building is that of the advertising that seems more real than anything else.

5) Running time. The original was purposefully slow while the overblown running time of the sequel comes off as director loving certain sets and trying to savor them far longer than he should've.

6) A myriad of logical mistakes and plot holes (kids with a 100% matching DNA are of different gender).

7) The opening shot with the closeup of an eye is almost beat for beat with the original.

8) The zooming sequence is hammered home by the sheer repetition.

9) The characters are bland, unoriginal and politically correct female copies of the originals, namely Madam and Luv.

10) The opening sequence is the unused part of the Fancher's script (watch Dangerous Days documentary).

Overall it seems that producers/writers have an erroneous idea of made the original film great. As if stuffing Biblical references into Neon-lit set pieces, inhabited by some pale copies of original characters and extending the awkward silences would amount to a great movie.

To sum up "Blade Runner 2049" does not reinvent the wheel, does not offer anything one-of-a-kind or even slightly memorable. There is no reason (other than cash flow for the studio execs) for it to exist. Save the cash and rewatch the original that actually challenges your intelligence and leaves you with a lot to think about.

Rating: 143

4

Content: 143 , Size: 2376

There's a lot to like about this movie. Ryan Gosling gives a fantastic performance, both nuanced and surprisingly emotional. The action, when there is action, is well filmed and brutal and fun to watch. The CGI is pretty much flawless, and I'm not joking when I say that while watching this movie, you'll think you're watching a real world. The film is interesting, it's well shot, well directed, it's visually stunning, it's pretty, and the score is very thrilling. But as a whole, this movie is just so god da*n boring.

Look, I like slow paced movies, but this film is beyond slow paced.

It's brain dead. It's literally like watching a person with no arms and legs try to crawl across a football field. I won't lie, at first I liked this slow pace because it built up a lot of tension, a lot of mystery, a lot of suspense, and I assumed that eventually the film would kick into high gear; it never did. The pace remains constant throughout the entire run time of this movie. It's excruciatingly slow. The movie is almost 3 hours long, and it feels like 6. I couldn't wait for this movie to end, I mean by the end of the movie I expected to look in the mirror and see that I aged 65 years.

And also, the film is also overly convoluted. I'm not saying that this is a confusing film, because it's not; in fact, it's pretty straightforward and easy to follow. It just simply felt like this movie was convoluted for the sake of it being convoluted. At the time of watching everything felt important. I had to pee so badly the entire movie but I didn't want to get up because I felt like everything I was watching was super important. However, only after viewing do I realize that there were so many scenes that were totally unnecessary, that were there only to make the movie longer, more bloated, and more self-important.

Unfortunately, there's just not much else to say. This is a simple movie, and it gets a simple review. Look, I wanted to give this a high score, but I just couldn't, and I don't understand why other people are because this movie is simply not enjoyable or entertaining. Yes, it's well made, a feast for the eyes and ears, but that doesn't make it a good film; it makes it a well directed and produced film, but not a good one.

Rating: 144

3

Content: 144 , Size: 1912

Let me describe the sequence of Blade Runner 2049 for you

Here goes:

Enter the cinema with an overpriced orange juice that is mandatory because in the last couple of years Hollywood has decided it is artsy and de rigueur to make films longer than 2 hours. The lights dim and commercials kick in for 10 minutes. A game for pre-teens wasting

daddy's money on mobile phones and plans kicks in. 2 minutes of endorsements for GM trucks (with some guy whose tone is so macho I roll my eyes) follows. Then there is a reminder to get the right debit card to be hip and in. Then the film follows for a whopping 3 hours almost.

You would think that there was a lot happening and we were kept excited. Alas, the only thing that kept me awake was the very periodical appearance of a beautiful eye candy whether real, hologram or laser show version that would keep things exciting.

If it were not for the sexy and lovable women Blade Runner 2049 was inane. Yes, inane. Apparently, not every film needs a sequel, a lesson Hollywood didn't learn from Hangover.

The script was so corny and the words so elementary one would be excused for thinking this is a practical joke. Head of police, yes head of police is told a big lie by a contractor, head of police believes it and all is good. No double checking, no verifying, no details asked no proof required. it is a matter of life and death for the order of the world and, of OK, let's keep rolling guys. The ending was also a joke. A vehicle is drowning and the hero is being drowned but in the last second kills the bad gal and swims back to the vehicle to mount a rescue (for the sequels that will follow). Replicants can have and make babies, but how? Oh well, watch the prequel Blade Runner Rogue Uno, which is coming out in 2020.

At that point all I wanted in life was to buy my own Joi and Luv and go back home.

Rating: 145

1

Content: 145 , Size: 1554

In the ongoing tradition of Harrison Ford's Action heroes of the 1980's turning out to be really terrible dads, we have Blade Runner 2049, the sequel to 1982's Blade Runner.

We meet a replicant cop named K who is of a new variety that doesn't rebel unlike those bad ones in the movies. So he tracks down a Runaway Nexus 8, even though in the original movie, we were assured that Nexus 8's only had 4 year lifespans. During the course of this, they discover the bones of Sean Young's character from the original movie, along with the realization she had given birth.

Our hero also has a relationship with a Hologram Girl for some reason. I guess so he is sad when she gets deleted later in the movie.

If you are watching this movie to see Harrison Ford reprise his role as Deckard, you don't get to see him walking around like someone's confused grandpa until 2 hours into an interminably long movie. (Seriously, I feel bad for Ford. Why does he do this to himself?)

So they want to find the child of Deckard and Rachel because this is a replicant that can reproduce, which is supposedly more efficient than just growing them, for some reason. They say they need more replicants to colonize the outer colonies, but of course, there are plenty of

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

people living in squalor, including a child labor sweatshop.

I can't emphasize enough how long, boring, uninteresting this movie was. It's like they watched the original and still had no idea what made it a good movie.

Rating: 146

1

Content: 146 , Size: 1081

I didn't realise 2049 also was the actual length of the film! It sure felt like it! 3 hours of boring dialogue, hollow characters and an embarrassingly weak story. Hard to believe Ridley Scott really made this!

The first Blade Runner worked the pace of the film brilliantly up to the powerful ending. The story was a rather simple sci-fi noir detective story with a twist. It made some huge comments on humanity and what kind of future we want. It worked on so many levels. It could be viewed as a simple sci-fi detective story or as a great spiritual journey that asked all the big questions. "And what can your maker do for you?"

The first Blade Runner had so many great lines but with 2049 I cannot remember a single quotable line. 2049 completely lacks all which made the original the best sci-fi movie ever. I take the same view as Rutger Hauer recently did. Why even try to do a second one? It would be as painting a second Mona Lisa. Or building another Eiffel tower.

A huge disappointment of a sequel that should never have been made.

Rating: 147

1

Content: 147 , Size: 965

I have not seen such a badly made movie in a really long time. The only thing good about this movie is the actors. who did a good job in doing what they were told to. But the story is a pathetic layering of a typical family drama projected onto flying cars that is supposed to be our future. The jest of story, we industrialize ruthlessly to shred nature and then struggle to find a human emotion within ourselves and wage a war to hold on to it. Pathetic, heard many times, over and over. I am not sure if the theme was disguised as to give a facade of art or was so poorly directed that it was not even strongly projected. Either way, it gave me headaches. And the music was so grossly out of sync with the picture, it made no sense remotely. The unnecessary loud noises had not 1% context with what was happening on screen. Ridiculously long, out of context, poor direction, senseless sound effects, sorry picture of the story. sheer torture to sit through it.

Rating: 148

6

Content: 148 , Size: 2335

After seeing the the sequel to the amazing and amazing first Blade Runner, i am not disappointed. But i am not impressed either. In summary, 2049 plays it's cards too close to the chest, but without the element of surprise or good main characters to back it up. So lets break this movie down shall we?

Sound: 3/10 The sound is perfectly mixed.... and that's that. Otherwise it's like the new Doom soundtrack, just a bunch of bass rumbling around on top of old Vangelis lines(but probably without the vintage hardware). A few of the tracks are Psybient/Solar Fields like, which really fit into the scenes. But overall, its pretty uninspiring.

Visuals: 7/10 The sets are amazing, but there is definitely something off. The first movie had some sets that were really realistic, which is what i think made the movie believable. There was dirt, glass, patches of color, mats, live candles. It is the same as the visual difference between Alien/Aliens and Prometheus, if that makes any sense. It is obvious that they tried to replicate the set pieces of the original, but it comes off as way, way to grandiose and large-scale.

Pacing: 2/10 Horrible. Every scene is dragged out so long that you could walk out, cook some food and come back without missing a single important thing in the story. Sure, the first Blade Runner was slow, but it wasn't moving like a drugged sloth. To sum it up, they could have easily pushed the story into an hour long movie instead of three.

Story: 4/10 This is really where they dropped the ball. The characters are so boring they might as well be extras, especially Deckers girlfriend. I didn't care about her at the start, and i didn't care about her when she died. Also, the main villain. I mean, really? What were they thinking? She is so one-dimensional, she might as well be played by Brian Thompson. And no, making her cry while she kills things does not make her more complex and believable. The villain in the first Blade Runner, played by Rutger Hauer, at least had a glowing personality. Also, some scenes and ideas are just there for shock value. You will know which ones they are.

In summary: There is not one line or scene in the whole movie which is even close to the quality of the monologue at the end of the first movie.

Rating: 149

5

Content: 149 , Size: 1008

As someone I know said, this is a "cargo cult movie". It has all the exterior of what a great Blade runner sequel would look like but there is little underneath.

Visuals are stunning, music and sound are good, camera work is as it should be, but when you get down to its core, there's little there. I am not usually the one to complain about a slow pacing or a plot that requires some suspense of belief, but here it seems they serve as a way

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

to achieve the deep and philosophical feel without actually being either. Acting overall is mediocre at best, actors fail to convincingly relay emotion of the characters, that are themselves written quite shallow, unrelatable and one dimensional. There are some interesting questions raised by the plot, the whole thing is far from a total disaster, but nothing is explored deep enough or clearly enough to be truly interesting or engaging. That's why this movie is going to be remembered just as a sequel to it's famous original.

Rating: 150

1

Content: 150 , Size: 484

This movie was so bad I can't put into words. I loved Blade Runner but this sequel is so bad I can no longer watch the original.

Music over the top
Acting nonexistent Length, felt like 6 hours, and not
in a good way

As people left the theater I saw shaking
heads.

Don't understand people raving about it. They must be connected
to the
film somehow.

Save your money, watch the original and don't let this
ruin it for you
like it did for me

Rating: 151

7

Content: 151 , Size: 5744

Being a hardcore Blade Runner and science fiction fanatic, I felt deeply compelled to write this review. I love Ridley Scott's original 1982 Sci-Fi classic. It is my all-time favorite movie. It had mystique and infused my imagination. It was a unique experience; hypnotic & surreal. The sequel, not so much!

My initial reaction of BR 2049 was that it's a gorgeous film. I was mesmerized by the striking cinematography and couldn't take my eyes off the screen. I will go as far saying that it's one of the most beautiful films I've ever seen. The rich visuals are so glaring it's hard to take it all in and grasp what you are seeing. From the opening shot you know you're in Blade Runner world. The overall look is instantly relatable to the first film and it's an amazing continuation in that regard. Also, the acting was excellent. The entire cast did a great job. However, once I settled into the film I realized that it is mainly a self-indulgent visual feast containing a weak story that lacks clarity & wisdom. There are obvious cliché moments and in certain aspects the story is comical and naive. The movie delves into complex philosophical themes and asks important questions but seldom explores them. It's all over the place. You get the sense that the film is not sure what it wants to be? It's clearly style over substance. Lots of homage is paid to the original through awesome images but the plot is paper-thin with

a few subplots & twists added to make it seem intelligent. But is it? Well, not really! I think the movie tries too hard to be smart but fails to engage due to its long running time & fuzzy story/script, which may end up confusing and distancing the viewer.

BR 2049 has been most widely criticized for its length, and rightly so.

It's overly long with some unnecessary scenes & dialogue whereas the first film was more subtle. BR1 was also slow-paced but in a different way. It had suspense and gradual progression to climax whereas BR2 is forced and even distracting at times. I love slow-paced films don't get me wrong! I can watch a film all day as long as it leads to a point and has tension. Certain films are deliberately made slow to establish a specific mood (e.g. Kubrick & Tarkovsky films). They draw you inside the film and make you feel like you're part of it. BR1 does this perfectly while the sequel is stretched out for the wrong reasons. It comes across as an excuse to showcase impressive visuals which is great if it moves the story along but not for the fun of it. BR1 had long takes and brief dialogue but it drove the story along smoothly and its characters behaved realistically. There was a seamless flow to it. It's humorous how BR2 tried to mimic this technique from BR1 yet failed because its characters talk & move super slowly unlike real life.

Although it's a visually stunning film, I found it to be almost void of

emotions and musicality. The characters were uninteresting and lacked emotional depth. In other words, I didn't care about them. I was not sure about any of the characters' motivations. In the first film, all the characters shined with charismatic personalities. They were unique in their own way and I truly cared about them. They embodied everything that makes us human. This was a vital element that made the original so special. BR2 on the other hand has sad and forgettable characters. It is a very sad film whereas the original had moments of happiness to mix up feelings and lighten the mood, which made it more realistic.

The music in BR 2049 was the biggest let down for me. It just didn't make sense because there was no music. A strange mix of very loud noises with faint echoes of original Vangelis tones interlaced (I listened to the entire score to be sure!). The musical score by Vangelis in the first film was one of the key elements that made the original my favorite film of all-time. I love atmospheric films that are visually & musically driven to tell the story. The music creates different feelings that make you fantasize. It makes you feel the movie and think about it long after it's over. The music in BR1 was incredible. It set the tone of the film perfectly. There was a haunting eerie atmosphere that along with the images created a hypnotic feel. Vangelis mostly used an electronic sound but he also incorporated piano & saxophone for melancholic effect. Not so in BR2. They messed up enormously this time. I know it's not possible to recreate Vangelis but they could have at least tried to create similarly-styled music by using the original score as a foundation. Even better, they could have perhaps made a completely original soundtrack all together. Blade

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Runner is an atmospheric film that is about feel and therefore must have a perfect music to visual ratio. Sure, they brought back one Vangelis theme for nostalgia but it wasn't enough.

To conclude, I enjoyed the film but unfortunately cannot say I loved it. I simply cannot fathom the enormous praise given by critics & moviegoers. I don't think they understood what made the first film brilliant. BR 2049 does contain the main elements required for a true Sci-Fi film but fell flat at further exploring its themes. The original film on the other hand is a masterpiece. It felt spiritual & spellbinding whilst the sequel did not. Should you go see it? Yes. I would still recommend fans and anyone curious to go see this film in theaters despite its evident flaws. But as a huge fan it left me disappointed. Maybe I had high expectations!

I gave it a generous 7/10

Rating: 152

3

Content: 152 , Size: 1431

All the problems with the original theatrical version of Blade Runner, which Scott Ridley fought against are here. Ridley has become the studio system.

Blade Runner 2049, likely the least desired sequel in history, is making Philip K Dick roll in his grave. What is the point of this almost three hour-long sequel? Of course, it is to continue the film industry's addiction to sequels and make cash. That is it.

Let me get this straight: the world is devastated and anyone who is anybody moves off-world, but people are living in spacious luxury in a casino drinking fine aged Scotch? There is beautiful white snow falling from the skies and sexy call girls approach you on the street? This world is for schmucks, but the main character has an artificial girlfriend with legs to die for waiting at home for him making dinner and giving him threesome sex? Someone book me a ticket back from off-world to Earth please!

This was the kind of logical misstep that Ridley fought against when the studio released BR to cinemas with a gorgeous drive through the countryside at the end of the original. It makes no sense.

Face it, this is the film that should not exist and by watching all these 'franchise' films we feed the stupidity of Hollywood.

BR2049 is the same as the last 10 marvel films, the next ten Star Wars films and the Ghostbusters sequel, but is prettier and more visual.

Rating: 153

3

Content: 153 , Size: 2728

"Blade Runner 2049" comes off incredibly long and boring. Not because of the slow pacing – "Blade Runner" had slow pacing too, but had the viewer hypnotized – but because there's no interesting thoughts present

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

and nothing new really. Thematically the movie is exploring the same questions (about being human etc.) as the first movie did 35 years ago. And the few 'new' additions to the Blade Runner universe are totally devoid of originality. Take for instance K's hologram-wife. Not only are those scenes totally unnecessary (that three-way scene, jeez!), but we've seen the concept so many times before (for instance in Spike Jonze's "Her").

Apart from that, the movie is riddled with plot holes and stuff that just don't make very much sense. Tyrell get's killed off by a replicant and his Nexus-7 prototype runs off, shortly after Tyrell Corp rushes a line of replicants with OPEN ENDED lifespans and no other safety device than implanted memories (that didn't work with Rachael). No. Just no.

Furthermore we are told the nexus 9 are programmed to obey. However K lies to his superiors, constantly acts on his own, acts emotionally from early on in the movie. He does not obey at all.

And the revelation of a replicant child being born has people talking about revolution. Robin Wrights Joshi says it will 'break the world',. But how? Rachael was the only replicant able to give birth and Tyrell took that secret with him. Neither the few remaining Nexus 8's or the 9's can give birth – so no, it doesn't break the world. It doesn't break anything. But the movie really wants us to take this very seriously (Hans Zimmer is doing his loudest to make us sit in awe).

And it gets even worse. Later we learn that Jared Leto's ridiculous bad guy Wallace (those monologues!) strives to learn the secret of making replicant babies. But why? That undermines the entire idea of replicants. Tailormade slaves with superhuman ability; strength, intelligence etc. that are controlled by implanted memories. Having replicants make babies the old way would offer zero control of the outcome and the child replicants would have to grow up, go to school, make their own memories. What's the point then? And what's the difference, from just having some people make babies?

A lot of people has called "Blade Runner 2049" 'intellectual sci-fi' and so forth, but I found it to be quite the contrary. The movie forcefully demands you to accept it as highly intelligent art, but if you scratch the surface, you'll find something very different.

Rating: 154

7

Content: 154 , Size: 2275

Beautiful and empty Bladerunner 2049 is the needless sequel to the 1980s classic.

Set 30+ years after the events of the first film we meet Ryan Gosling continuing in the Bladerunner tradition of shooting robots. Along the way, he discovers a great secret that might change the social order of a world that is made up of humans and they're purpose built slaves.

All of that was covered in the first 20 minutes of the film by the way.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Skip ahead to the 3rd act, grumpy Harrison Ford shows up and, well, that's about it.

Leaving the theatre my wife and I tried to decide just why Bladerunner left us both feeling so indifferent to it's existence. She had never seen the first film, I had, but our feelings were the same. Bladerunner is great to look at and I appreciated the nods to the original, but, it became quickly apparent our apathy stemmed from the fact nothing much happens in this movie.

Office K's (Gosling) investigation into a missing person moves at snails pace and none of the people we meet along the way are as interesting as the scenery around them. One example is Wallace (Jared Leto) the new Tyrell and the main villain of the film. His speeches are dull and only go to serve the plot, he leaves all of his serious evilness to his sidekick while he stays home sporting a handicap which must be a desired physical affectation considering how easily it could be treated in his time.

The main theme in both Bladerunner movies is one day the slaves will cast off their chains and be free. Sure, there's stuff about love and self-awareness but these are side issues that have been explored elsewhere to better effect. The main focus of 2049 is humanity needs an indentured underclass to do its heavy lifting and either you are for it or against it and that is a pretty thin premise for a movie this long.

Late in the film Officer K sits on a deck chair staring out over an irradiated city. He looks like a man lost, not knowing where to go next. This moment is the perfect metaphor for Bladerunner 2049. All of it's surprises are revealed too early on leaving both the audience and characters to mull over the same obvious of choices for the rest of the movie.

A wasted opportunity.

Rating: 155

8

Content: 155 , Size: 424

I love the book so I was really excited to see this, and I have to say I was not disappointed. The acting was brilliant and the film very well made. Aside from a few changes it mostly follows the book quite closely which I was pleased about and the end was especially well done. I have to confess that I haven't actually got round to seeing any of the other adaptations of the book yet but I certainly enjoyed this one.

Rating: 156

9

Content: 156 , Size: 833

I haven't seen the 1974 version so this movie easily stands out in all aspects to me, whether it was the camera view or the cast ensemble. While reviewing, people often forget the issue with the original story i.e. it's set entirely in the train. Considering the limited space that

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

they had, Branagh does an amazing job with the direction. This isn't just a remake but in fact an entirely different adaptation. Not that it runs away from the main story but it has a sort of different take on it. Apart from that, Branagh easily manages to portray Poirot with all his eccentricity. (The accent was the pull factor for me). Josh Gad does an amazing job with Hector McQueen. Judi Dench shines as Princess Dragomiroff along with Pfeiffer as Mrs. Hubbard. The only bummer was the fact that it leaves you wanting for more.

Rating: 157

8

Content: 157 , Size: 1225

I was a bit skeptical about this movie, but I must say I was pleasantly surprised. Of course, it's not perfect, and sometimes Branagh overdo it a little, but whoever likes the genre will be captured by the fantastic atmosphere and will not be bored, because Branagh has been able to put some pepper on the story. His Poirot convinced me and the old glories like Judy Dench, Willelm Defoe and Johnny Depp do their job and do it well, but in my opinion the most interesting notes come from the young people: I personally loved Josh Gad and Daisy Ridley, but the real surprise was Sergei Polunin: I mean, for those who saw him performing as dancer, it's not a real surprise, but it's really hard to believe it was his first time in a movie! He has given to his character this melancholy, turbulent and passionate aura, halfway between a Shakespearean prince and James Dean. His expressions, his little gestures, the way he looked at his wife, he made me feel like a teenager who cannot wait to buy his poster and stick it over her bed! And let me say, that guy definitely knows how to handle a woman as well as he can deliver a kick! As usual, more the critics hate a film, more it worth to be seen.

Rating: 158

7

Content: 158 , Size: 1182

I went to see Murder on the Orient Express last night and this is my review. I am rating it 7/10

A quick overview of the film is that someone is murdered on the Orient and the worlds best detective played brilliantly by Kenneth Branagh must solve this case with caution and intelligence.

The film starts smoothly with some laughs produced by Kenneth. We meet every character before the train journey and that's when the guessing begins.

I really enjoy a film that keeps you guessing and gives you a few unexpected twists. The orient certainly delivers that.

Pros: Few well timed laughs, Kenneth Branagh is fantastic, Guessing Twists, Being focused on what is going on Lovely scenery, Great cast and an intense story.

Cons: To be honest, with the type of film it is and

plot. There isn't
anything bad I can say about it because it delivered Agatha Christie's
story very well.

An entertaining watch for those who like a mystery film with
a strong
cast and to be engaged throughout but getting you to guess at most
stages of the film.

I guessed loads but was wrong!

Thank you and
hope you enjoy this review

Rating: 159

10

Content: 159 , Size: 1715

We always do the same mistake when a movie is made following a best
selling novel is that we compare the novel and the movie. But we must
keep in mind that novel is always superior than movies in many
aspect. So my earnest request to the audience please don't compare it
with the novel. When you compare you will lose the momentum of the
movie. Because it is an excellent movie...A pure crime thriller of pre
modern era. It has suspense as well as buried past mystery of all the
passenger's life. This made the detective process more complicated.

The
movie has many aspects to cheer about. It has a good portrait of
some 18 th century look with all those etiquettes and manners. The
movie is fully loaded with the part part story of different suspects
that made it difficult for the audience to guess the final answer.

As you
know most central roles were done by excellent actors and
actresses there is no complaint about the acting. All the acting was
very much splendid. Only it can be said that they have done it a little
heavy. The dialogues are sometimes a bit too much for the audiences to
capture.

Over all the movie is a little slow..Like the thriller movies of
early
1960's or 70's . But it has many good things to offer. A group of
excellent actors together with a fine plot and diffuse suspense has
made it a good enjoyable movie. But as i said it is a bit slow and
dialogue dependent movie some viewers may experience it as a boring
time. i have to say you had better show some patience and you will find
the gold. This is A movie that can shake you when you will watch it
even for the second time..Imagine what will happen when you go for the
first time??????

Rating: 160

10

Content: 160 , Size: 1192

Kenneth Branagh does it again. For many years the sniffy set of
Guardian-types would turn up their Metropolitan noses at Agatha
Christie. Her writing was, evidently, not high-brow, she churned out
too many and (horror of horrors) she wrote airport thrillers.

But Christie
understood human nature in its myriad forms and she wrote

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

accordingly: at times with brilliance.

It is this which Kenneth Branagh so fabulously unveils in his Murder on the Orient Express. Yes, he has assembled a world class cast of superstar actors, but it's Branagh himself, both as actor and Director, who pulls the real meaning of this story out.

This is a tale of loss, sorry, unrequited grief and, above all, revenge. You don't get much more powerful emotions in human existence and these are wonderfully executed here.

It's fantastic, even if you know the plot. Go and see it and watch this wonderful tale again from a different perspective. Don't go just for light-hearted entertainment. It is that on one level. But it's also a tale which plumbs the depths of human existence: what Poirot calls 'the poison of deep grief.'

Fabulous film.

Rating: 161

4

Content: 161 , Size: 302

My wife and I looked so forward to seeing this movie. Unfortunately it was boring. No drama, no suspense. The cinematography was excellent. we actually saw people leave the cinema before the end of the movie. The star studded cast really don't shine. Very much a Sunday evening TV viewing movie.

Rating: 162

8

Content: 162 , Size: 2779

Fill a train with a most impressive cast line up, throw in a grisly murder mystery and have the mighty impressive Kenneth Branagh go on a quest to find out who done it and you got yourself a delightful little movie which will most certainly entertrain.

A take on Agatha Christie's popular novel Murder on the Orient Express, the story follows that of detective Hercule Poirot, who is called on business to London, and so takes the last available room on the Orient Express. Though wanting nothing more than to relax and enjoy his journey, he inadvertently finds himself working, when one of the passengers is mysteriously killed.

It's a wonderful simple story which sees detective Poirot go from guest to guest questioning them on their whereabouts on that fateful night. The opening scene did worry me somewhat with it's overly smart-arsed series of events, akin to that of a last few SHERLOCK TV episodes. It risked going off the rails and being too clever, well beyond believable, but thankfully for the main mystery it calms itself down.

The 1h 54min runtime steams by as I sat and enjoyed first class performances from all the cast. Stand out characters were Daisy Ridley's Miss Mary Debenham, Josh Gad's Hector MacQueen, Leslie Odom Jr.'s Dr. Arbuthnot and of course the brilliant Kenneth Branagh as the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

brilliantly quirky and intelligent Hercule Poirot. Only Michelle Pfeiffer's performance lacked somewhat and took away from what could have been a much more emotional scene towards the end.

For a story that takes place almost entirely on a train, the director uses the limited space well, for as this narrative unfolds, it doesn't feel too claustrophobic, even in the narrow hallways and the tight compact cabins. Shifting the camera into creative perspectives at times helps keep the scenes fresh and visually stimulating (I especially enjoyed the birds eye view of the murder scene). The pacing is snappy and energetic and at no point feels like its running out of steam. Kenneth Branagh should also be commended for the way he juggles a story consisting of such a myriad of actors, by giving each character their own perspectives and motives, helps to keep the viewer on their toes; questioning every nuance and detail and while some are barely given any screen time, most feel substantially explored.

Overall Murder on the Orient Express conducts itself well, an interesting 'who done it?' mystery that will keep you guessing throughout. Wonderfully paced and fantastically performed. After something a bit different from your usual sci-fi/superhero adventure then this is just the ticket!

You can find more reviews like this over on my website:
www.popcornography.co.uk

Rating: 163

1

Content: 163 , Size: 348

DO NOT waste your money on this film. The script is bland, the CGI terrible, the acting bland and the directing a tour de force of Brannagh's egomania. Even his French accent was rubbish. I cannot believe how films like this ever get the money to get made. It was about as suspenseful as unleavened bread and deserves to simply be forgotten.

Rating: 164

1

Content: 164 , Size: 362

Worst film I have seen in my life 95% of it is just bullshit talking...

Few errors in the movie, waste of money.

I was expecting more out of it... than just pure talk.

Johnny Depp should of have played a better role than 15min...

Two other people that watched this film have left the cinema... that just shows how boring it can get.

Rating: 165

6

Content: 165 , Size: 1050

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

There's some outstanding points in this film namely

1) Kenneth Branagh - his portrayal of the world's greatest Belgian detective is the best I've seen by far

2) Cinematography- exceptional alpine backdrops . Hand-held camera-work was exceptional

3) Casting - superb all star cast

But then there's the points that weren't so good

Some of script / delivery of lines was unintelligible

Some of the CGI was brilliant but some was quite poor and at one point the train looked like a child's toy! Also it felt a bit like the Polar express at times and that's over twelve years old !

Overall the film just could have been so much better it had all the ingredients , setting , cast , story but it failed to deliver a top notch performance. Shame really as I really looked forward to this and grudgingly paid the extra £4 for a reclining chair !

It sets itself up for DEATH ON THE NILE - I just hope that's a better rendition .

Pad.A 6.5/10

Rating: 166

5

Content: 166 , Size: 1111

Good: The amazing all-star cast of academy award winners. Even though each actor/actress plays their role well, no one was a standout. The setting of most of the movie is the Orient Express, which helps contribute to a trapped and isolated feel and makes you feel as if you were there with the detective. The introductory to Hercule Poirot is great, but as the movie chugs along

Bad: Overall, the movie lacks comedy and heartfelt moments. At times, the accent of Poirot is hard to understand, which leads to clues that are not clearly understood and a story that is hard to follow along. The movie is more of an interrogation of each character, by just going down the huge list of suspects and giving each character equal screen time. It progresses at a slow pace and the clues never lean me towards one person or another. I also did not find the murder to be inventive or creative.

Overall: Even with an outstanding cast, the movie suffers from a generic plot. The movie lacks the engaging aspects of a crime movie and relies too heavily on its cast to deliver its moments.

2.7/5

Rating: 167

1

Content: 167 , Size: 308

This is what happens when you give the Force Awakens raving reviews, you ruin cinema. Almost none of this endearing, the ensemble cast is not used well at all and perhaps not even considered much of a force save Brannagh. Johnny Depp is simply not good, Daisy Ridley is even worse. Terrible waste of time.

Rating: 168

10

Content: 168 , Size: 509

What a movie and what great acting. Frances McDormand has done amazing job and deserves awards for playing Mildred Hayes. Although a very serious subject, this movie is a comedy.

The punch lines are to the point and absolutely hilarious. I went to the Toronto International Film Festival to watch this movie and boy, do I consider myself lucky to have decided to watch it.

The story, screenplay, direction are amazing. After The Grand Budapest Hotel, this movie comes as a breath of fresh air.

Rating: 169

9

Content: 169 , Size: 2750

Having recently won the People's Choice Awards at TIFF, Three Billboards outside Ebbing, Missouri is very easy to see why it won.

Three Billboards is a dark but also funny and heart-felt story about one woman's quest to get justice for her daughter's rape and murder. After Mildred Haynes buys three billboards with words written on them accusing the town's well-liked sheriff of having not found her daughter's killer, it sets a series of events that turns the citizens and the cops against her.

The thing I can say about Three Billboards without going into spoilers is that it is wildly unpredictable. One moment you think things are going one direction as expected then it takes hard left turn that only adds to the dynamic between the characters. As the pressure within the town builds and anger is pointed towards Mildred, we see many of these characters evolve in order to deal with tragedy and grief and learn to find peace. And the movie goes through a roller-coaster of emotions. One moment you are laughing your butt off from the hilarious dialogue then you feel like someone just punched you in the gut. With every victory you think this story brings you feel like it was taken away from because of the world's unfairness and injustice. In lesser hands the mixture of dark and comedic tones would not work, but director and writer Martin McDonagh knows how to balance them to perfection.

The performances here just through the roof. Frances McDormand delivers a performance that will for sure get her into the Lead Actress awards race at the Oscars. As Mildred, McDormand just cuts loose with her performance with every line of hate, cynicism and cursing towards everyone she feels doesn't truly understand the internal pain she is going through. But McDormand does now and then show a soft side to Mildred. It shows that Mildred is just person like everyone who has her own way of dealing with the tragedy of losing her own child. And Sam Rockwell also gives one of the best performances of his career as the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

flawed and very misguided cop Dixon. The character of Dixon is short-tempered, volatile, and not bright with some baggage of his own that the locals accuse him of. But Sam Rockwell brings his charm and sincerity to what could be a rather unlikable character. And in the latter half, you see Dixon go through a tremendous arc of learning to care about others rather than just being angry towards them. Other great performances that should be called out are Woody Harrelson, Peter Dinklage, John Hawk and Caleb Landry Jones.

Three Billboards outside Ebbing, Missouri is easily one of the best movies this year and is worth seeing once it comes out in wide releases.

Rating: 170

9

Content: 170 , Size: 1039

I watched this movie during the 2017 Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF) after it had won the Grolsch People's Choice Award. I already had high hopes for this movie and it definitely did not disappoint! Concept of the movie seems pretty easy to understand: Mildred Hayes (played by Frances McDormand) is still grieving the loss of her murdered daughter and challenges the local sheriff's (Woody Harrelson) inability to find her killer. From watching the trailer I was a little unsure if this was going to be a drama or a comedy, but turns out it was both, or more accurately a dark comedy. The first few minutes of the movie really set the tone for keeping you interested in the dramatic core, maintaining the humour in events as they unfold. Not only are the characters perfectly cast individually (example my fav Sam Rockwell as Officer Jason Dixon), but the writing of the entire script makes it so easy to enjoy this entire movie.

Writer/Director Martin McDonagh deserves a high five for this accomplishment!

Rating: 171

9

Content: 171 , Size: 2038

It seemed that the pregnant police detective Marge Gunderson from &x27;Fargo&x27; would forever be the most memorable character of Frances McDormand&x27;s acting career. But now I&x27;m not so sure. Mildred Hayes, the heroine from &x27;Three Billboards&x27;, is a serious contender. This might well be her best performance ever.

The part of Mildred Hayes was written with McDormand in mind. Hayes is a divorced single mother, living with her son on the outskirts of a small, remote town. She had a daughter too, but the girl was raped and killed on a quiet mountain road not far from home. Frustrated by the lack of progress of the investigation, Hayes decides to rent three dilapidated billboards, publicly accusing the local police chief of

incompetence. By doing so, she attracts the attention of the media, angers almost the entire town and causes a succession of increasingly violent actions.

Although the film is about grief, anger, revenge and violence, it is extremely funny. Above all because of Hayes's stubborn character and her ability to verbally humiliate people by her extremely sharp tongue. The monologue she delivers when a priest visits her house to tell her she has gone too far, is priceless.

Apart from McDormand's performance, the screenplay is another great feature of this film. The story is full of unexpected twists, gradually shifting the positions of the main characters towards each other. None of the characters are one-dimensional: they all reveal surprising parts of their personalities as the story moves forward.

And then there is the overall, almost Coen-esque atmosphere of a small town full of colourful characters. There is a racist cop, a friendly midget, a smart advertising guy and a pretty girl who is so dumb she doesn't know the difference between polo and polio.

It is hard to mention something negative about this film.
Three Billboards is, from start to finish, a great movie. I can't imagine anyone not enjoying it.

Rating: 172

10

Content: 172 , Size: 2093

I tried to write the summary of this movie for three days and still i have not found the correct words to connect them in order to make a sentence capable of expressing the quality of it. I have written the summary many times and i have erased in every occasion. So i decided to show some dots in the summary. That is the symbol of how excellent the movie is.

The plot :

The plot is very much uncommon. it has so many facts that it offers you a guessing 2 hour while you goes through the movie. It provides enough backbone to the rest of the element of the movie. It creates a concrete base upon which the movie stands firmly.

The mystery :

As the movie deals with a murder it contains enough mystery to shake the audiences. Scene after scene all this unpacked. But they have to wait till the end to solve the puzzles.

The resistance :

The movie is about the resistance of a mother. It starts with the desperate mission of a mother to bring the killers of her daughter to light. Those billboards, the sudden attacks, burgaining against the local authority.. all these are the part of a resistant mother which is also the part and parcel of the movie.

Acting :

Acting in my view is up to the mark. Frances McDormand is exquisite in her role as a mother seeking justice. Others have also come to the party.

Direction :

This is the characteristics of the movie i was most impressed with.

Although the plot and the acting is out of question but it is the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

director who has the sole credit to connect all this. He has slowly but cleverly unfolded all the sector available. He is good enough to make the movie what it looks like in the projector. He has turned the raw materials to a mature masterpiece.

Questions and answers :

last of all the main event is the answers of the question that were aroused during the first session of the movie. You have to wait to find the answers. This waiting makes it more attractive.

So clearly it is a movie of great quality..a bit older type..but you know old is gold..

Rating: 173

9

Content: 173 , Size: 1111

Outstanding work by writer/director Martin McDonagh, in a return to form after the off-kilter "Seven Psychopaths." This film about the joint cul-de-sacs of loss and revenge. It is both horrifying and touching, and it is also very funny.

McDonagh, a first-rate playwright, knows how to structure scenes and write dialogue. To do him justice, first-rate actors are required. They must love the succulent stew of characters he cooks up, because he catches the very best.

I can't find enough superlatives for Frances McDormand and Sam Rockwell. They are, here as in everything they've ever been in, great. They are ably supported by Woody Harrelson, Caleb Landry Jones, Clarke Peters, Sandy Martin, Lucas Hedges, John Hawkes, Amanda Warren. The only weak link in this superb ensemble is Abbie Cornish, who is warm and smiley but is unfortunately out of her depth: a very odd piece of casting.

Cinematography, production design, costume, editing, music - they're all top of the range. But in the end it's down to McDormand and Rockwell, and the brilliant script.

Rating: 174

8

Content: 174 , Size: 536

I was almost afraid from watching the trailer that this would be one of those overwhelming movies because it involved dark and serious subject matter. I was pleasantly surprised that it was actually enjoyable because of the way it dealt with all the serious subjects. The script mixed just the right about of comedic relief (no, it isn't a comedy though there are some laugh out loud moments) with a compelling story. Each and every actor's performance was spot on for their character which helped make it well worth seeing!

Rating: 175

10

Content: 175 , Size: 2504

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is a dark comedy that has an a-list cast with names like Frances McDormand, Woody Harrelson, Sam Rockwell, John Hawkes, and Peter Dinklage. It centers around Mildred Hayes, a woman whose daughter was raped and killed, and who believes that the local police have not done enough about it. In reaction, she erects three billboards outside of her town that send a message to the sheriff about the state of the investigation.

Writer/director Martin McDonagh (Seven Psychopaths, In Bruges) has outdone himself with this one. In my opinion, if this isn't one of the top Oscar contenders come awards season, then Hollywood has officially lost its mind.

Basically everything about this film works: from the acting, to the writing, to the direction. McDormand gives the performance of her career here, giving us humor through all the pain clearly shown on her face. Rockwell also gives his best performance here as a cop who isn't that bright and is more than a little racist.

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is probably the most unpredictable film of the year, and that's coming from a year that includes films like Baby Driver and Logan. There are scenes where you think that you know where the plot is going, but then midway through it completely flips the script.

For the entire run-time of this film, I was invested. It has the perfect run-time; it ends exactly when it needs to and there is not a scene that feels out of place.

It seems like one of the hardest things to do in film nowadays is to balance comedy and drama. However, this movie does it effortlessly. Each scene has just the right amount of comedy and drama, and sometimes, despite the fact that you're laughing, it's easy to forget that jokes are being made.

Also, the message that this film gives off resonates very powerfully with you after the film finishes. It makes you see the good side in humanity, despite our flaws. No character in this film is a cliché; one-dimensional shell of a person. Everybody has a reason for being there, which is more than some films recently have offered.

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is easily one of the best and most enjoyable films of 2017, and it will make you laugh, cry, and think all in one sitting. There are not any clear flaws with this film that I can find, but I am still searching.

I give Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri an A+.

Rating: 176

10

Content: 176 , Size: 3644

It goes without saying that dark comedy is very difficult to accomplish. I would almost say it's harder to pull off than regular

comedy because you need to be able to keep people invested in the dramatic aspect of the film, while still keeping them laughing throughout the majority of the duration. Director Martin McDonagh has matured as a filmmaker over the years, starting off with In Bruges, which was pretty much a flat-out comedy, to Seven Psychopaths, which placed him a little further into the spotlight, but I must admit that Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is not only his best film to date, but also one of the best films I've received the pleasure of witnessing all year. From laughter to genuine tension and heart, this is a film that's pretty much perfect all around. Here is why I can recommend this film to everyone.

After the tragic death of her daughter, Mildred Hayes calls out the

local authorities on three billboards, publicly stating that they're not doing their jobs and not a single arrest has happened since the death of her daughter. While publicly displaying this is upsetting to some, she sees it as a point being made. Through some very cleverly written humor throughout the entire film, levity is brought to the table in times of sorrow, making this a very easy movie to watch. Although the story itself is quite depressing, this film is written in a way that will still find a way to make you smile.

From the very first few frames of this film, you can tell the tone will

be handled perfectly. Written and directed by Martin McDonagh with pure class, you can tell that he was very passionate when bringing this film to fruition. Every line of dialogue either progressed the story along, developed a character, made the audience laugh, or provided deep insight into the event of the murder itself. While not having the bearings of a conventional murder mystery, many viewers may not like the way this film concludes, but in the context of the movie as a whole and everything it's setting out to accomplish, it really does have a realistic and true finale.

It's arguable that some of the law enforcement officers play just as

significant a role as Mildred does throughout the film, being pretty much present every time a revelation occurs, but I gravitated the most towards Officer Dixon. I've always been a huge fan of Sam Rockwell, and his character here is one of the most essential to this story, set on being there from beginning to end, trying his absolute best to be of any help. While Woody Harrelson's portrayal of Chief Willoughby is by far the most important to the story at hand, it's the characters around him that drive him to his actions throughout the course of the movie. The characters are truly what make this film as likable as it is, and they're all wonderfully drawn.

Overall, when looking back on my experience watching Three Billboards

Outside Ebbing, Missouri, I find myself not being able to wait until its official theatrical release to watch it again. I found this film to be stellar in every sense of the word. From a noteworthy performance by Francis McDormand, devoted secondary performances, a screenplay that will have you consistently laughing, while also being emotionally involved with the serious storyline at hand, and pulling the audience

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

in with its subtly composed score, everything about this film is worth praise. This was a huge surprise for me and I can't recommend you checking it out enough. Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is a fantastic piece of modern cinema.

Rating: 177

9

Content: 177 , Size: 1109

Seen at the Viennale 2017: writing reviews about several movies in the last year, I nearly have to pass on this one. Three Billboards is of such high quality that it is nearly impossible to comment on it. Only highly professional reviewers should dare to write something about such high quality script, directing and cast. Why not ten stars, then? We still have to see, whether this one will become a classic movie for the Top 200. Maybe, it will. For sure it earns such a high rating. Three Billboards touches soul and heart from 10 minutes after the beginning up to the end. Seldom I changed from laughing to sadness in such a high frequency. But the movies greatest strength is: it gives hope. Hope in the possibility that people can change from the worse to the better. People are changing in this movie. People can change in real life. We get remembered that this is possible. For sure, I will never forget the highly emotional moment, when Dixon risks his life by grabbing the burning crime file of Hayes and jumps through the fire wall. This movie deserves every single Oscar it will (hopefully) get.

Rating: 178

9

Content: 178 , Size: 880

I won't even try and sum up all my feelings about this movie because no matter what I'd write, it wouldn't do it justice.

What I'll say is that it's brilliant, it's dark, it's hilarious - and not in a slapstick-funny-kind of way but in an authentic and real funny kind of way - and it transitions so effortlessly between that hilarity and despair that I was captivated throughout the entire film.

McDormand shines. Rockwell shines. Harrelson shines.

Everyone shines.

So far, for me, this has best screenplay, best actress in a leading roll and maybe even best actor in a supporting roll written all over it.

Every film lover is gonna talk about this gem in a couple of weeks/months and I'm sure that every film lover is gonna absolutely love this film.

Thank you, Martin McDonagh!

(9.1/10)

Rating: 179

7

Content: 179 , Size: 3900

In the words of poet Harivansh Rai Bachchan, the beauty of film is "You

get poetic justice in less than 3 hours. You often don't get poetic justice in a lifetime. If that'd be the case than the collective works of Martin McDonagh serves as a counterweight to such thinking. His films, often involve looking in vain for the nebulous concepts of love, justice and meaning in a post-modern world. His characters, likable if deeply flawed, shout into the void but never find the answers they seek.

Thus it's hard to truly gage a film like Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri. Much like In Bruges (2008) and Seven Psychopaths (2012), this film is rich with wit yet syncopated in its own world of messy loops, twists, turns and tones. The story begins with the melodies of Renee Fleming's 'Tis the Last Rose of Summer'; but then ends the first five minutes on the screen in capital letters. The letters spell out 'RAPED WHILE DYING, STILL NO ARRESTS? HOW COME, CHIEF WILLUGHBY'. So starts the saga of the Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri, sanctioned by a grieving mother; printed for a dying man. The mother in this case is Mildred Hayes (McDormand), who much like her billboards stands unwavering. She's hassled by everyone from Sheriff Willoughby's (Harrelson) clueless deputies to her ex-husband Charlie (Hawkes). Still, even when her son Robbie (Hedges) is incensed to give her the silent treatment, Mildred demands her message be heard. Her teenage daughter was raped and murdered seven long months ago and nothing has been done. She wants justice.

Yet the funny thing about justice in this movie is the moment you get a good handle on the concept, the film bleeds it away like water from outstretched hands. So too do the characters. Every time you get a firm understanding of who they are, something logical yet wholly unexpected forces you to assess and reassess. No one else best exemplifies this than Sam Rockwell's Office Dixon who goes from a racist Barney Fife to a numbed Travis Bickle with nary a dropped beat to make you question the change.

The ensemble carries the film through a lot of ugliness with grace. We glide uncomfortably close along the sharpened edges of rape, murder, abuse, suicide, alcoholism and racism. All the while questions like: 'is it okay to be angry in an unfair world?' and 'how do our decisions affect others?' smear into the ashy black comedy and imposing melodrama. Deep care was given to breathe life into these characters. Even when someone as non-consequential as Charlie's nineteen-year-old girlfriend (Weaving) enters the fray you can't help but admire how these people interact and curious about how they must feel.

Martin McDonagh more than ever invites comparisons to the Coen brothers in this film. A signal that to me at least proves McDonagh is ambitious, but out of his weight class at this point in his career. For while the Coen's approach their films with the same character-first, free-form narratives, there's always a level of benevolence behind the cynicism. Here, instead of smirk-worthy amusement there is anger.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Instead of cosmic curiosity there is more anger. Instead of wonder, there's just more anger, and you know what they say about anger; it just begets more anger.

If anger were the spice of life, then this murky soup would definitely be worth consuming. But as it is not, regular filmgoers should approach this witty, richly rendered film with extreme caution. McDonagh's oeuvre is an acquired taste and those liable to agree with Bachchan's approach to film may walk out severely shook. But for those fixing for an overall decent barnstorming black comedy, the 'Show Me' state might just have something for you.

Rating: 180

10

Content: 180 , Size: 1471

This movie first drew me in because it was an R Rated Black Comedy. As I have been on the lookout for them since watching the Voices, I happily settled to watch this movie. And it was a good thing I did. Firstly, the director, Martin McDonagh, is one of the best I've known, and he did not let me down with this film. He managed to display what he does best, creating a funny movie with a dark backstory. This was as heart moving as it was heart-wrenching. If you needed an example of an oxymoron, this would be the one. Funny and depressing, it tugs at your heartstrings whilst keeping you on a journey of laughter.

The cast, perfect. Being honest, I hadn't heard of Frances McDormand before. But after this film, I will never forget her. An amazing choice of the dead daughter mother figure, she's stubborn and great. Will be seeing more of her work in time to come. Woody Harrelson and Sam Rockwell have great on-screen chemistry. Unlike McDormand, I am a huge fan of Rockwell, loved his work in the Green Mile and Confessions of a Dangerous Mind and if you aren't a fan of him for whatever reason before this film, you will surely be one after. I'm surprised he managed to sneak in a few dance moves as well, he really stole the show.

So, if you are looking for something to brighten your day, I cannot recommend this enough. As I have said, one of the best dark comedies of our time. Please, watch it, you will not be let down.

Rating: 181

6

Content: 181 , Size: 1286

So far, this film has an IMDb rating of 8.3...and this is extraordinarily high. But the film has been in festivals and I am sure the rating will change some when the film is in general release. As for me, I think it's incredibly overrated.

The story is about an angry mom, Mildred (Frances McDormand). Her daughter was brutally murdered and raped...and the police haven't been able to do anything with the case. So, in desperation and anger, she

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

rents out three billboards and calls the local Police Chief (Woody Harrelson) to task for this. Surprisingly, most of the town comes down against Mildred...who was just exercising her First Amendment rights. What happens from there...well, just see the film.

There were many wonderful scenes and characters in this picture. But, there were also many main characters who were just god-awful and unlikable...including Mildred! In fact, later in the film when she thinks the police department has wronged her, she burns down the building and accidentally flames one of the cops! So, no one who is a main character in the film is nice or likable...making this movie a bit of a hard-sell. Too much cussing (even by 2017 standards), very crude language and overall nastiness prevent this one from being a must- see film.

Rating: 182

7

Content: 182 , Size: 1680

First off. Some people are calling this a horror movie. It is not. This is a mysterious drama-thriller with supernatural elements, and just the slightest hint of horror. Now, I expected this so it was OK, but be aware. Expectations is a movie worst enemy!

OK! So Thelma is beautifully shot. Thought has gone into each scene, and each camera angle. The movie overall is very calm, kinda quiet. Eili Harboe is excellent as the titular character. The other characters are good too, but she stands out. She has a very natural way of acting. Also she is beautiful, and so is Kaya Wilkins, which plays her new friend. Gorgeous people.

Like I said, Thelma is a calm, low key movie for the most part. I did think it dragged just a tad in the middle part, but both the beginning and ending is pretty good. It has certain romantic tendencies, but it was done in a not annoying way. Good.

There are some scenes with CGI here, and they are very well done. You almost won't notice they are CG, except from the fact that you know you are watching something impossible. That's good. Thelma is not heavy on big effect stuff, but the effects that are, are excellent.

Joachim Trier is Norwegian movie critics golden child. They love him over here. Personally I'm no big fan, but then again, Reprise is the only movie of his I've seen, so I can't really say. But Thelma is the kind of supernatural movie movie critics are actually allowed to like. Because it's kinda artsy, ya'll! ;) Anyway, I liked it, didn't love it, but maybe I will later? I doubt it, but who knows! Know what you are in for, and you will probably like it too!

Rating: 183

8

Content: 183 , Size: 1821

Imagine a film that is part Carrie and part The Exorcist combined with a lesbian love story. I know that sounds a bit confusing but this is a pretty accurate summary of the picture.

When the story begins, young Thelma (Eili Harboe) has gone off to college and things seem pretty normal. However, out of the blue, she has what appears to be a grand mal seizure that lands her in the hospital. Soon after, one of the folks who witnessed the seizure, Anja (Kaya Wilkens) introduces herself to Thelma and they soon become friends. In fact, over time they become more than friends as both the women begin having sexual feelings for each other which causes Thelma to have a huge internal struggle because this violates her strong Christian upbringing. A bit later, Thelma enters the hospital for testing to determine exactly whether or not she has epilepsy. During the testing, her defenses are lowered and her intense feelings for Anya run wild so wild that Thelma's supernatural powers manifest themselves. What exactly are these powers? And, what family secrets are there related to all this? And, how does this all end?

As I said, the story reminds me of a couple other films but it's also original in many ways. It also keeps you guessing and that's the biggest reason I recommend the picture. Where all this is going and how it gets there make this a very special film, though I have a couple important warnings. First, there are lots and lots of flashing lights and epileptic viewers might have difficulties with this. Second, if you have a strong fear of snakes do not watch this film! There are several snakes in the film but one incredibly vivid dream that is nightmare fodder involving snakes and you need to consider this before you see this excellent movie.

Rating: 184

10

Content: 184 , Size: 591

Back from the cinema and i am still...wow wow wow.

It was just a kinda boring evening, so i took a walk to my favourite cinema in Reykjavik downtown spontaneous.

Unfortunately it was the smallest cinema hall but OK i took a set in the middle of the second seat row. So it was like the last seat row in the big cinema hall. Everything was quiet, not many peoples...perfect.

And the movie started, first scene, what the hell, OK, curious, interesting and from the beginning to the end, it was just stunning, stunning and stunning. The best movie 2017 i have seen so far!

Rating: 185

7

Content: 185 , Size: 1538

After reading the fantastic reviews and hearing from friends what a

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

great film this was, i went in with big expectations. I was, oddly not to my surprise, a bit let down, and i think others will be too. But that doesn't mean that you shouldn't go out and watch it!

Harboe is the perfect choice for the titular character - every emotion is portrayed with the utmost of believability. Her connection with Anja feels natural and at times entrancing. If Harboe doesn't win an Amanda for Best Actress i'll boycott the award show. Just saying...

The story is engaging, but slow-paced. I don't mind, others might. This is a beautiful piece of art, executed with finesse by Trier. The soundtrack is underscoring the action without adding too much drama, and you've gotta love every moment Susanne Sundfør's music is playing in the background. A perfect fit for this film. The screenplay has a lot of potential, but stumbles here and there. In a way i wish it had been a bit easier on the use of metaphors and symbolism, but at the same time i can't quite grasp what Thelma really is about. Visually, it's stunning - and that's not a given for Norwegian film. But film needs more than stunning photography, cinematography, characters, cgi and music. And that last bit is what's missing here.

Summed up: if you don't like Trier's other films, you might not like this one either. But it's worth the money (!) and your time. Film er best på kino!

Rating: 186

10

Content: 186 , Size: 1293

Lights flicker, the wind rises and animals behave strangely when Thelma becomes agitated. She is capable of mysterious and ethereal powers, and more than she knows because her manipulative and fundamentalist parents keep such things under wraps in home-school. As Thelma heads to college in Oslo and stops taking medications, not only do her parents lose control, she loses control of herself. Psychogenic seizures rack her body. Passions and anxieties multiply along with her abilities. This is when Anja, Thelma's close friend, does something extremely upsetting for Thelma. The next day when Anja can't be found, Thelma has a sickening feeling she had something to do with it. She searches for answers to the secrets and powers that beguile and haunt her.

This thrilling, deep, complex and sensual film explores a whole realm of different theories and possibilities. I was surprised and delighted by its twists and turns. It crosses borders between reality and fantasy, and light and darkness, and explores the good and bad in human nature. The actors are amazing, especially Eili Harboe as Thelma and Kaya Wilkins as Anja. It is fantastic to discover that the roots of psychogenic disorders go back as far as Joan of Arc. Seen at the Toronto International Film Festival.

Error: '>' not supported between instances of 'str' and 'int'

>>>

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

RESTART: C:\Users\winbr\Documents\research\importing data\phase II\knowledgeBase.py

```
['/title/tt3348730?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=0QCQV83XJX9AASQ
TGXKB&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cht_t0',
'/title/tt6217804?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=0QCQV83XJX9AASQT
GXKB&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cht_t1',
'/title/tt1981128?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=0QCQV83XJX9AASQT
GXKB&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cht_t2',
'/title/tt5308322?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=0QCQV83XJX9AASQT
GXKB&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cht_t3',
'/title/tt1856101?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=2773216402&pf_rd_r=0QCQV83XJX9AASQT
GXKB&pf_rd_s=right-7&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cht_t4',
'/title/tt3402236?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=1971069222&pf_rd_r=0QCQV83XJX9AASQT
GXKB&pf_rd_s=right-8&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cs_t0',
'/title/tt5657846?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=1971069222&pf_rd_r=0QCQV83XJX9AASQT
GXKB&pf_rd_s=right-8&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cs_t1',
'/title/tt5027774?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=1971069222&pf_rd_r=0QCQV83XJX9AASQT
GXKB&pf_rd_s=right-8&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cs_t2',
'/title/tt6304046?pf_rd_m=A2FGELUUNOQJNL&pf_rd_p=1971069222&pf_rd_r=0QCQV83XJX9AASQT
GXKB&pf_rd_s=right-8&pf_rd_t=15061&pf_rd_i=homepage&ref_=hm_cs_t3']
```

tt3348730

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=20>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=30>

tt6217804

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=20>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=30>

tt1981128

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=20>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=30>

tt5308322

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=20>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=30>

tt1856101

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=10>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=20>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=30>

tt3402236

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=0>

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=10>

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=20>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=30>
tt5657846
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=0>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=10>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=20>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=30>
tt5027774
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=0>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=10>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=20>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=30>
tt6304046
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=0>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=10>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=20>
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=30>
['<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3348730/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6217804/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1981128/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5308322/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1856101/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt3402236/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=20>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5657846/reviews?start=30>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=0>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=10>',
'<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=20>',

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt5027774/reviews?start=30',
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=0',
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=10',
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=20',
'http://www.imdb.com/title/tt6304046/reviews?start=30']

4

Since the Saw franchise is one of my biggest guilty pleasures when it comes to horror, I've been hoping for a new installment ever since The Final Chapter was supposed to end the franchise back in 2010. Even though the movies got progressively worse, there is something about this franchise that always draws me back and makes me want to re-watch it.

I had high expectations for Jigsaw because of two reasons: one, the producers stated in an interview that they were offered more than a hundred scripts for a new movie from different writers, but had never been pleased with any of them until they discovered a script so good, which ultimately got picked to be adapted; second, the Spierig brothers, Jigsaw's directors, had previously directed Predestination, such a smart and enticing sci-fi time-travel movie that I liked quite a lot.

After seeing Jigsaw, I left the theater disappointed. I'll start with what I enjoyed:

The score by Charlie Clouser is just as fabulous as it has always been and manages to go in line perfectly with each scene.

The performances didn't bother me at all, although none of the actors really gets to shine. Laura Vandervoort and Paul Braunstein stood out here, with the latter generating some funny moments worthy of admiration.

The direction was very polished and the movie was competently filmed, but the Spierig brothers weren't given much to show their creativity on. This leads me to the negatives.

The CGI is very good. There is, however, one scene in which I was feeling as if I was watching one of the most recent Resident Evil movies and that didn't really work for me.

What I didn't like:

The ideas in this movie and its overall plot are somewhat underdeveloped. I know that this is supposed to be a new beginning for these movies, but as a franchise starter, I wanted more to be explored. The plot falls flat because the movie cuts from scene to scene so swiftly and tries to cram multiple narratives into 85 minutes, that ultimately none of them makes an impact.

Saw is known for its visceral traps and torture devices, so I was looking forward to seeing more of that. However, the game presented in this movie has next to no memorable traps. That is because they are a lot tamer than what we've seen before and they simply can't hold a candle to all the ingenious traps from the past movies.

The character development is another issue in this movie. The characters are so uni-dimensional, with some of them being there only to fill the screen. And I'm referring to some of the main casting here.

Also, character arcs are left unfinished and the movie felt like it ended when the most important part of the story was about to happen.

The editing undermines what could've been some very suspenseful scenes because of its sloppiness, by cutting from one narrative (the game) to the other (the investigation) at random moments.

Now, it all comes down to the twist. Was it good and unexpected? Well, no, not really. It's not necessarily because you can predict it from miles away (for which the movie offers hints throughout the run-time) due to its small set of characters, but because it had no resonance for me. It didn't blow me away and you could've predicted it from the marketing of the movie alone. Just like with the traps, it just doesn't have the same visceral feel as the past movies and it doesn't really make you crave for the release of the next chapter.

Overall, Jigsaw sets itself apart from the previous movies in the series with the help of the two directors who manage to make the movie look stylish and slick, but ultimately, it doesn't succeed in creating the sense of urgency that some of the old movies had and, sadly, disappoints on almost every other level. And yes, there are fan-service moments, but as a fan of this franchise, I felt very little excitement when they happened.

Hopefully, if the movie does well in terms of box office, the sequel will improve upon this franchise "reinvention".

6

As a saw geek, i thought the film was a good film for an average movie goer, but for a fan of the franchise i found it underwhelming. the "he had another apprentice all along" was lazy in my opinion. The idea Elanor was really Cortbett from saw 3 carrying on jigsaws work (she was around 11 yrs old in saw 3, so the age ties in 7 years on) - this would have been a far more inventive and plausible option than some random character that we are told was on the scene long before Hoffman and Amanda is too weak in my opinion. I also think, making you believe Jigsaw is alive again, only to find out it is scenes from 10 years ago is like giving a kid a Christmas present and taking it away again. However clever, leaves you disappointed. Frustrating. I understand the series needed re-inventing for the new audience, but to forget its old fan base and not have any mention at all of Hoffman, Amanda or Dr Gordon is like ordering Chocolate cake and getting trifle. whilst trifle is nice, its not what you wanted. There are certain rules in a saw film that jigsaw sticks too, well so should the producers.. even if those characters aren't appearing, they should have included someone, even if in name only, especially Dr Gordon as he was alive and well only 7yrs ago and would have known about Logan surely. All in all, a decent film. For a saw fan though its a little disappointing

8

"Let's Play A Game"; those simple words haunted the theaters for years,

signaling the start of yet another slasher movie in the Saw series.

What started out as a unique twist to the serial killer saga was only the start to a face cringing, spine tingling, sometimes nauseating saga that hooked people in until around the sixth-seventh iteration when it finally ended. That was until this year, where the saga was to be reanimated in hopes of bringing more bucks to the theaters. Will this eighth installment have the ability to defy death like it's protagonist antihero, or is it dead like the poor victims of his games. Only one way to find out and that is read my friends, so let's get started!

LIKES:

Fast-Pace: With all the slow movies I have been seeing, I give props to

the Saw series maintaining their consistent pace. From start to finish, the tale keeps moving, sparing no second for unnecessary details or attempts at prolonged character development. The mystery of figuring out the identity of the game master, mixed with the spread-out trials that promise a messy end are well-balanced to keep things going.

Decent

Characters: A horror movie often has many brain-dead characters begging to be chainsaw fodder. Fortunately, Saw movies continue to choose players who have a little more complexity and skills than many of the Spring Break teens favored. The tradition lives on, as each player has a little more buried within, still having a few obviously destined corpses, but others who have a shot at making it out. And for those not in the game, but trying to solve the mystery, they too have some layers to them that may or may not be pertinent to the story. It's those engaging elements that are crafted in the story, making them more engaging to follow.

The Presentation: Another component I still like is the presentation of

the movie. Many go for the kills, but the better component for me is how they separate the story into two settings. One is still the players trying to escape the closes thing to hell's torture chamber, while the other are the outside characters hunting down the "maniac" that continues to weave his traps. The ability to entangle these two components, balancing their timing to provide clues and hints to the story all while keeping you invested in the game. Such a dynamic presentation provides those checks and balances necessary for a slasher movie, and keeping things as fresh as possible.

Twist: As many of you know, Saw movies are all about the ability to

throw that last wrench into the gears to blow your mind. Despite my experience with predicting endings, this one got me. The questions I asked were on the right path, but they were able to drop enough interfering factors to throw me off the trail. Jigsaw once again impresses me with their storytelling, and their mastery of presentation. I can't say much more, but ask the right questions and you might get the answers.

DISLIKES:

Lazy Deaths: Those first few movies were convoluted in their traps.

They had designed devices that were an impressive display of

imagination, horror, and engineering that gave everyone a kick in terms of design. While Jigsaw still has the impressive connections and storytelling, it unfortunately fails in the terms of the traps themselves. They are surprisingly simple for the most part, and a little more reserved than I expected in this modern era. Yes, there is still plenty of blood in this battle for moral consequences, but they didn't involve quite as much skin crawling madness.

Acting a little cheesy: Despite the engaging characters, there are times when there are a few inconsistencies in the character's intelligence, or often the case their acting. While decent for the most part, the writers hit some blocks in terms of dialogue or direction they wanted the characters to go. There are those moments the
tension
overwhelms them into hysterical messes that are cheesy rather than believable. In addition, the dialogue sometimes gets lazy, just going into expletives than conducive dialog. A weak dislike yes, but I'm drawing on straws.

The potential for a series: Like the original series, I had hoped for an ending, but then this movie showed up. While I did enjoy it, I am worried that the way this movie ends sets up the potential for a new series to start. Sure, this means more Saw goodness, but it also means the potential to dilute this movie into another run of the mill series that will become a product of lazy producing. Hopefully that won't happen, but these days series are the prize most companies seek.

The VERDICT:

Jigsaw is the piece of the puzzle that brings quality back to the lovely massacre series. Going back to the roots, the writers were able to bring back a brilliant presentation and characters you can follow. All the nostalgic qualities rush in with the deadly traps, bringing that fast-pace, twisting tale that captivated us all those years ago. While still not the first movie, especially in terms of death design and potential to revive the series, it was a welcome addition to the series. So, if you are looking for the horror movie of the month, Jigsaw is your answer for the theater my friends.

My scores:

Crime/Horror/Mystery: 8.5 Movie Overall: 7.0

9

Jigsaw doesn't have over the top traps, where you chop off your arm (Saw VI). OR impossible traps where you put your hand in a jar of acid to retrieve a key just to get your chest ripped open (Saw III). History repeats itself and Jigsaw goes back to their old roots being simple, with basic traps and a mind blowing ending. Unfortunately there's one trap I disliked, it involves lasers. It relies on CGI too much, the stakes are high but the practical traps are way more fun and creative. With wires, tricks, chains, a puppet and the classic pig head, this film will leave you with a smile on your face.

7

October 26, 2017 Middle East Premiere Dubai

It's been 10 years since the death of John Kramer known as the Jigsaw.

But, some bodies are discovered, the investigation leads to the conclusion that Kramer is back...!! Now, the Officials are chasing the dead.

Saw released in 2004 was one of the best Gore, Slasher Suspense Horror Thrillers. After the completion of film school, Director James Wan with his friend Leigh Whannell wanted to make a short film, but limitations hold their hands. Hence, they decided to make something that has limited location, actors etc. This short film of 9 minutes gave green signal to the Saw movie. But, the franchise was rated straight down from Part 1 to 7.

This movie is from the Directors of Predestination (2014), Spierig

Brothers... hold on, don't expect much. But, if you are a fan of Saw film, you can take a breath. Definitely this is not as bad as the previous installments.

Mostly, a cocktail of the previous films. The beginning was really good, it had hope and expectations about the movie. This dropped soon. But, managed to pick up towards the end.

6

Jigsaw is back for an eighth film after several years from the conclusion of a terrible supposedly final chapter saw movie. Jigsaw is an okay film, its not terrible neither good. With directors The Spierig Brothers direction and a new set of writers trying to bring back the Jigsaw killer. There was a way of continuing on with the franchise either with a new twists that tries to bring back the torture porn of death traps and either a new killer or perhaps Jigsaw's legacy was not over.

I enjoyed the first few Saw films from the bloody gory death traps, the

connection on how every victim has with each other, and the twists that is played with Charlie Clouser's music theme in the final minute of the movies. As every film goes on, it just feels like they straying away from the plots connection and having new victims that has no connections and more bloody traps. Jigsaw film however, does not feel like a Saw movie. The plot feels more like a police procedural drama, were Det. Halloran (Callum Keith Rennie) is following up a case were bodies are discovered. And same with the video tapes of Jigsaw's voice (Tobin Bell). Is the Jigsaw really dead? Or is there a new Jigsaw copycat that is taking over his games? Halloran is trying to follow a lead that has several people playing the game in a hidden barn. Were they are fighting for their lives of going through several death traps, as they are suppose to solve the clues to why they are there. With the help from forensic pathologist Logan and Eleanor (Matt Passmore and Hannah Emily Anderson). They are trying to solve their own mystery when traces of evidence is leading back to Jigsaw being alive and the connections every victim has with each other.

The plot played like a TV police procedural drama which took away from

the Saw movies feel. It was fun to see Halloran trying to solve the mystery with the victims and Jigsaw. And then the movie flashes back to the victims in the barn, who are forced to play a game that will end bloody.

The death traps and the bloody sequences are quick and less gory than the previous seven films. And the traps are also quite forgettable this time. Sure, for the audience that can not handle blood and gore will still find this disturbing.

There are also a couple of unpredictable twists that works with the film and is what leaves you talking about it. Definitely not as great as the first film. The cast was also decent. Matt Passmore is a fun new addition. Callum Keith Rennie was okay. And the cast of victims that were forced in death traps are not easily memorable.

Like all horror films, the first couple are usually the best and the rest are just repeats with less of a plot. And this film does not add or bring anything new to the direction of the franchise. Overall, Jigsaw is a fair horror film. The twists works well. The thrills is decent with the victims being forced to injure themselves to survive. The plot does not feel like the Saw movies. And the death traps are forgettable.

I rate the film 3 out of 5 stars. I ll recommend it if you want to watch a bloody torture porn film or if your into that. Otherwise, I ll suggest it as a rental.

7

I have seen the first 3 movies in the series as the reviews of the successors were not good. But I am happy that they made reference to these movies. And this time no flashbacks!

The production design and visuals (gore and blood) were genuine for the viewer to believe. The traps are quite forgettable this time but the twists and turns were very good as I didn't see that coming in the end.

An attempt being made by the directors to make it comparable with the first two installments. Though there are some flaws in the middle, but the ending justified the shortcomings!

Worth your money!

7

I'm fan of Saw franchise since I was teenager, so my hype about this new entry was so high. The movie has 2 plots, one showing 5 victims needing to survive to the dangerous games of Jigsaw and other telling us the story about a police department investigating some stranger homicides.

The plot about the surviving group is nice, there are some creative traps, however there's less violence and bloody scenes than in the previous entries and also has some plot holes, for example Jigsaw seems to know who would survive since the beginning. During the middle of the movie I was wondering how's possible Jigsaw recorded a tape with the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

name of that character? How he knows that character is alive? He could die during the beginning of the game. Meanwhile, the plot about the polices gives us some great twists and I'm sure you won't see them coming.

Jigsaw is a sequel with some reboot elements, doesn't change the horror

genre, but is funny and I suggest it for who wants to turn off the brain for 90 minutes and just enjoy a nice movie. It's not the best Saw film, however is one of the bests.

Rating: 7/10

6

I was a huge fan of the original series, although as more films were released the thrill lessened. The first is a Classic and may have one of the best twists of all time, and that's what makes it such a great film. It wasn't about the horror.

This one, although entertaining, same awkward acting by many characters, same grizzly traps, and most of all a twist, which I believe everyone expects, however I feel there's some major plot holes that leaves me feeling dissatisfied. Of course I won't ruin for anyone, but this film reaches far, way too far, in my humble opinion.

Very reminiscent of the original, but fails in the end. Maybe they'll do better next time because a new Saw film is always welcome to take a swing.

Note: the red headed coroner was super hot, even before she let her hair down and took her glasses off. Way too hot to be a coroner. (not being sexist, just keeping it real)

6

Saw is back and Jigsaw has returned to reclaim Halloween. But, you'll immediately find yourself confused. After all, Jigsaw has been dead for many years. As soon as you start watching a lot of things just don't make even a hint of sense. Everything seems jumbled up... until the film's many twists and turns become clear and, with yet another rising crescendo of the iconic theme tune, a series of flashbacks, big reveals and gory images, a Saw film once more concludes seemingly laughing at its audience and said audience will once more leave feeling sick to the stomach and very confused. Yep, Saw is back... for better or for worse? In this case, for better. Kind of. After the horrendous last installment, the only good part of Jigsaw's legacy was the roller coaster at Thorpe Park. Now... maybe things could be back on track. It hasn't redeemed the franchise; the usual bad acting, logic gaps and lack of genuine scares still applies. But at the same time, this installment prioritizes thought provoking moral themes and tension over gore and flashbacks and it is an intense, unsettling experience. With memorable death scenes, a reasonable amount of tension and a relatively solid plot, this should be satisfying enough to most. It doesn't entirely feel like Saw since virtually no-one, not even those still alive, returns from the previous films and the grimy, unclean

atmosphere of the old films is replaced by a cleaner, more high-tech
vibe, but many will like the various nods to the past movies.

6/10

9

Very enjoyable saw movie with more backstory. Kinda funny at times but
still just as sick and twisted with plenty of blood and guts. You gotta
love the bucket heads, an instant saw classic trap. Ending was mind
blowing as always and I'm glad to see saw going back to it's roots.
Can't wait to see where this new trilogy will go. If you have seen the
first seven saw films you definitely have to see this one!

6

It would be totally fine if SAW franchise had ended at the 7th
installment, however, I don't mind that there's a new one, let's
break
down why

Jigsaw is the 8th installment, and surprisingly, it's not that
bad, but
it's kind of unnecessary and doesn't feel warranted

It does have
it's positives

They have changed some things especially the visual
style. When the
trailer came out, i was disappointed that they had done away the gritty
look of the previous SAW films and are bringing a new cleaner visual
style that felt a little less scary but after watching the film, i have
to say, the visual style is a breathe of fresh air and a nice change
up

Another good thing is that the film focuses less on the torture porn
aspect and instead it focuses more on solving the puzzle aspect of the
traps. They have toned down the violence, but i'm okay with that
because they did focus on making the traps more of a challenge instead
of a torture. But if we talk about the traps, yes there were a very few
maybe one or two original and innovative traps but the rest were very
uninspired and a less gore-y versions of some traps from previous SAW
films

The film does have a cool and unexpected turn of events. There's
an
interesting mystery going on and an intriguing 'whodunnit' story line
that keeps you guessing

Let's get down to negatives

I know that
the directors of this film, Spierig brothers are good at
their jobs and they know how to make a film and i really liked their
previous film that was Predestination but here, even though they showed
that they understood the basis and core aspects of SAW franchise, they
could not manage to deliver anything too impressive or anything we
haven't seen before except the overall change of tone and visual
style

The writing is mediocre, but like i said it does have some cool twists
that you may not see coming, it still is very cliché and mediocre.
Like always, there is excessive use of flashbacks to tell many parts of
the story, which may not be a negative but excessive use is excessive
and can be considered lazy at times

I've seen critics mentioning the

cringe-y acting and i agree that in many scenes, some acting is very over the top and a bit cringe-y

Wrapping up the review, i would say, Jigsaw is not as good as it could have been but its not the worst of the franchise. In fact, it may be like the 4th or 5th best film in the SAW series if i had to rank them in terms of quality

I do appreciate that Jigsaw combines some of the best ideas of some SAW films and delivers some good moments but it barely does anything to justify its existence beyond making more money for the franchise

If you like most of the SAW films, you may enjoy this one too. Even if you only like the first few SAW films, i would say give this a chance if you want to, you may end up liking it. It's an easy watch with a small run time that doesn't drag too much and it's very fast paced.

i would give it 6/10

6

This one upset me. This was the most engaging saw film since 1. Loved the detective/crime story as usual and FOR ONCE I wasn't subjected to just gory nonsense. It's a bit gruesome and grisly due to the morgue photos and dead bodies - oh yes there was blood - but they saved the big gore till the end as a payoff. Loved it up until the end where it all falls apart.

The ending itself was stupid. I would have laughed at the killers final line (it's so PATHETIC compared to saw 1's & game over;) but I was sitting there with jaw on the floor from how BAD the ending was. Ruined everything. I even forgave the lapses in logic cuz it's saw and when saw is good - it's fun. I thought the traps were well done and the silo trap was the best since maybe the shotgun tilt a whirl of 6. Too many things unanswered, some missing characters...

SPOILERS

I thought the main chick was gonna be Jeff's daughter - and she wasn't so I was really upset about that lol When the killer is revealed I was dumbfounded... I liked the cast a lot and thought it was well written on the whole but just all comes apart at the reveal. Tobin's scene was great - the highlight of the movie. I guessed that the game had already happened - seemed obvious right?

What happened to Ella(?) and what happened to one leg guy? I thought tobin was dr. gordon at first - then I remembered it already happened - but where is he? Where's Hoffman? I loved the cancer diagnosis angle - that was great but I was really hoping we'd find out her last name was Denlan. I ended my fan edit of all films in one long ass movie with the & don't trust the one who saves you; part... I really thought that was where they were gonna go - with Jeff's daughter...oh well.

END OF SPOILERS

In the end they got a lot right but the wrong ruined what was the best one (maybe 3rd best) after the original. Really disappointed and I have no idea how to include it my fan edit cuz it almost seems insulting to

put it in cuz it has nothing to do with series almost. A real WASTE of a good ride.

I think the blade on this saw has finally dulled - this new direction just seems like it will ruin the original series. That's what's SO maddening about this movie - I loved it until the end. It was MORE than making up for the unwatchable POS that was 7.

So can I say watch it? Yeah but it will disappoint you but the ride is worthy enough if we still had videos stores. "Watch when it comes on TV" is vague and it sounds stupid. Wait for it on video was always an easy good review lol

I'd rank the films from best to last -

Saw (4 stars - a classic in it's own way) Saw VI (4 stars - great sequel) Saw IV (3 1/2 stars. Best twist in the series. best misdirection) Saw III (3 1/2 stars - it's just SO bloody and mean and nasty. A real mean spirited movie) Saw II (3 stars - good sequel. still fun)

Saw V (**1/2) I like it but only works as a piece and not it's own movie) Jigsaw (** stars) Almost best since original - terrible ending) Saw VII - utter trash. Used about 12 mins of it in my edit lol

Peace.

6

I am in a unique position because I would not have chosen to go and see this movie. I was invited to it for a friends birthday, I can give you my honest opinion with no prior experience\expectations with the franchise.

Not once did I feel I was missing out having not knowing the series, As a stand alone movie it did well misdirecting suspicion in some parts. However in a lot of movie I found myself telegraphing what was going to happen and knowing what was there for a second viewing which I like to be in the dark for until the second time round. I can forgive this cause there won't be a next time. The people I was with all said the same thing... "The first was the best, and the movies went downhill until this one."

The acting was good the effects were better.

However, the twist at the end was a masterpiece I will give it that. No one could have seen that coming.

10

I was very excited when the first jigsaw trailer was online and my hopes were extremely high. When the film premiered I immediately went to see it and my god I was mind blown by the plot and characters. Like previous saw films the story is some what the same with a few added twist to each characters background. The puppet looks very awesome with new features added and Tobin bell still does the voice of him which was very amazing. I finally happy to see films like this getting back to what the term HORROR is frankly there hasn't been any good horror films that were great. Mainly nowadays horror films tend to be you're typical tacky cliché jumpscare gimmick with annoying loud banging sound and mainly focusing on cheap demon/ ghost filth " the conjuring, the

babadook, bye bye man, ouija, sinister, oculus, paranormal activity and those dreadful insidious films. Finally horror movies are getting back to its roots of pure horror because humans are the one that you should be scared.

6

There will be spoilers in the last paragraph.

When I saw the first trailer I was stoked on seeing it first. Now that I've seen it, it brought some pretty disappointing moments where I wanted the series to be changed.

First off I wanted to see more unanswered plot holes from Saw The Final Chapter like why some people were involved and stuff. Second, I thought they would be adding more modern technology in the mix. Third, I expected a whole new feeling to the film that was different from the others. Finally fourth, I wanted Waaaaay more mystery and drama.

Although this film didn't meet my expectations it's still ranking 3 out of all the saw movies. There was nothing new and if they are to make a sequel they better add something new to the series. I gave it a 6/10 for it's come back to the series, it's new traps, and it's twist I SAW coming. We need a new Jig from the series c'mon!

!SPOILER! I easily saw 2/3rds of the plot coming when they first mentioned the spiral trap and the rumor he used it before every other one of his victims. Also I knew it was that dude who faked him dying by the lasers because we've seen it before in Saw 1, also because they found skin sampled in his freezer. Ultimately the twist was pretty easy to see. Sorry to bring your hopes down but they should've left it Saw: Legacy and made JIGSAW a new, brighter, more innovative movie after.

10

I'm a huge fan of the Saw franchise & I never saw this coming a Prequel and a Sequel all rolled into one, my mind is blown away. Jigsaw is brilliantly written as they all are, the traps are especially good & the twist was incredible & spoiler coming & that we were watching a prequel game all along! and the reveal of Jigsaw so we think he's alive! my jaw was on the floor! the 7 years has been worth the wait as Jigsaw exceeded my expectation.

6

I agree that JIGSAW is an unnecessary sequel in the SAW franchise, but if I'm honest the whole series has been unnecessary, aside from the first movie. This one's a densely-plotted lukewarm rehash of previous sequels and ideas, with five characters engaging in more against-the-clock deadly traps while the detectives on the outside

attempt to figure out whether the killer Jigsaw really is back and on the prowl again.

As with the sequels, this is pretty confusing stuff although it all

makes sense towards the end, although I wasn't all that convinced by some of the twists. An aged Tobin Bell returns to his role (thanks to one of the aforementioned twists) and is a welcome presence, and the traps are gruesome and nasty, although not the most inventive of the franchise. All together, this is acceptable fare, although not a film you'll want to bother revisiting.

6

The Saw franchise went downhill since the original back in 2004. Though it was assumed to have ended in 2010, another sequel has arrived seven years later. My main concern with this was the fact that it was probably going to end up being another film that's made for fans of violence and gore, who enjoy this series just for the traps and who makes it out alive. While Jigsaw is exactly that, there are many more layers to this film than I was expecting, making for a somewhat enjoyable viewing experience. I won't be recommending this movie to anyone who has never seen a previous installment, nor will I recommend it to those who have and have disliked it from the beginning. Jigsaw isn't going to win any new fans over, but in terms of popcorn horror entertainment, I think you can still do much worse than Jigsaw. It tries very hard to please hardcore fans, and I truly believe that it does so. This really isn't all that great of a movie, but let's dive into why it's better than it deserves to be.

Like always, you follow the police as they try to solve the mystery of the ongoing puzzle so that they can try and save as many lives as possible. These films exist for their traps nowadays, but I have to give credit where credit is due and offer some applause to the neat little twists this movie pulls off throughout its final act. Like most of these sequels, the twists are too little and too late, but you can tell that the writers care about trying to give the audience a little more than just killing people in inventive ways.

The characters throughout this film receive some backstory, but that's also the biggest issue I had with this movie as a whole. Looking back on it, I appreciate the fact that each of the characters throughout the core game was fleshed out more than I was expecting them to be, but they honestly make you hate every one of the players, which was a huge distraction from me, having absolutely nobody to root for. Yes, the majority of these movies are like that, but there was always someone to latch onto, hoping they would make it out alive. Instead, we receive a slew of characters that have all made terrible decisions in the past, forcing you to slightly be okay with what the killer is doing to them.

Although I didn't care about any of the characters, Jigsaw found a way to win me over in the end, with a few very clever reveals, making the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

characters themselves seem less relevant anyway. You don't go into a Saw movie to see fleshed out characters, but when a movie can ground itself and invest you even in the slightest, points can be given for that. The character of John Kramer is the character who's fleshed out the most here, giving a small, but detailed level to the franchise itself, which was quite the surprise for me.

The deaths themselves are pretty impressive in terms of being memorable because everything from Saw IV to Saw VII is a complete blur to me. I'll be remembering some of the set pieces when looking back on Jigsaw and that's easily more than I was able to say about most of the sequels that this franchise has offered through the years. There are nods to previous deaths throughout some of the games and there's definitely a reason behind that, which makes it worth waiting until the end.

Overall, like I said, Jigsaw won't win over any new viewers, but fans of the franchise will be able to appreciate the cleverness that it has to offer when it ties itself into the timeline of the series. The dialogue is very generic, the story itself isn't anything you haven't already seen, and the characters are extremely forgettable. That being said, the traps are fun, the conclusion is satisfying for those who have followed the series from the beginning, and the spirit of the original is still present enough to warrant a recommendation for hardcore fans. Jigsaw works for what it sets out to achieve, but it's still the same old schtick. I had a fun time with this movie because I've seen every other film in the franchise and I still found this one of the best. It's really not that bad in retrospect.

8

So it has been a long time since a Saw film came out but this was certainly worth the wait. Jigsaw is not very scary but it isn't trying to be. It is a smart and fun entry that modernizes the Saw franchise. It was REALLY cool to see Tobin Bell on the big screen again, like that guy is so freakin cool! The characters range from cool to not cool, but the worst character is the one who survives! It's the person you wanted to see die the most, yet he walks out A-OKAY. These Saw movies have a knack for doing that! The gore in this movie is INCREDIBLE and features downright the BEST gore moment of the entire Saw franchise, where a guy's head is split down the middle like an apple slicer. It had me cheering, because it is not only the best gore moment in the entire Saw franchise but one of the best gory moments I've ever seen in theaters! The twist at the end sent chills down my spine, like wow I never would've guessed it and it made so much sense too. I was so happy this film was good. I would probably rank it in fourth place behind Saw 1, 2, and 3, and it ties with Saw 6. I would recommend you buy a ticket tonight!

4

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Hollywood's cash cow advantage for Halloween. The traps were meh. Too tamed compared to other saw movies. The twist at the end was awful nearly the whole movie turns out to be one big flashback. Flashbacks are starting to become an annoying cliché; both in movies and TV series. It's a sequel that didn't need to be made. I recommend not bothering with this one.

8

REVIEW - JIGSAW
Who remembers the very first Saw film and how through the course of the many films the whole premise seemed to get lost to the investigation. The premise that it was a game with an outcome you could choose. In many ways this latest installment returns to the original premise but..... Generally a good (not great) film but certainly worth your time. One or two plot holes which of course I will not give away. My biggest problem with the film is why? As with Ghost In The Machine, why tell us the complete story in one film, why not leave us wanting more? The above doesn't generally spoil the film which does have a lot of twists and turns. Rating 8 out of 10

7

I saw Jigsaw, starring Tobin Bell-24_tv, The Quick and the Dead; Matt Passmore-The Glades_tv, Son of the Mask; Callum Keith Rennie-Longmire_tv, Fifty Shades of Grey and Laura Vandervoort-Ted, Smallville_tv. This is the 8th movie in the Saw franchise and yes, I know, the last one back in 2010 was called the final chapter but he's back-you just can't keep a good man down. This is the first Saw movie that has the character's name, Jigsaw, in the title. What is remarkable to me is that Jigsaw/Tobin was killed off in the third Saw movie but the producers keep coming up with ways for him to make an appearance-and yes, they have an explanation here, too. This one starts with bodies turning up dead and all the evidence points to one man as being responsible, Tobin. Callum is the lucky policeman that gets to try and match wits with Tobin. Matt plays the medical examiner that gets to autopsy all the dead bodies showing up-and some of them are in pretty bad shape. Laura is one of the lucky contestants that gets to play Tobin's games, and yes, they are just as gruesome as always. Now I know that these movies are not for everyone-my wife hates them-but if you do like them, then you will probably enjoy this one, too. I know I did. It's rated R for grisly bloody violence, torture and language and has a running time of 1 hour & 31 minutes. I enjoyed it and would buy it on DVD.

10

The best horror movie in the world with this section as well he showed me that he was still brilliant. The story is well designed, a sight is a flawless point as we like :) I have no idea how much idiot critic instead of shutting down everything why they do not settle down movie? I find it outrageous to get rid of movies that are not should.

5

So,tonight Jigsaw premiered in my cinema and for some reason,the cinema room was empty,so,that was OK,I was alone. The film followed the story of another guilty bunch who are pursued in to a game of grisly games as the new killer may actually be Jigsaw himself,yes,Jigsaw. So,I actually kind of wished I did not have to see this,I had already gone on a big shopping spree with my family,surprising me due to it being my birthday and afterwards,I was wrecked..but,for you guys,I saw it! The opening scene in Jigsaw made me actually wanna fall asleep,I was really tired but sat through the whole thing and was it worth it..not really. I kind of wished to be honest,I did not see Jigsaw,wasting money on myself,the film was just another crappy Saw film,well,not too crappy. Jigsaw was not really all that bad,I thought the traps though were kind of poor having it have the exact same kind of theme of traps to Saw V,one thing though I did love about this film was the ending that really had me like..what?! I wont spoil,but it was a brilliant ending,the acting in the film was OK,something that was weird was the setting,I felt also that this was not even a Saw film,when you think about the first seven having been set in old dungeons and stuff,this had barley any resemblance to it which is something that I admired,the actual very ending to the film was OK with that trap at the end being definitely crap,I mean,like there's bad traps,but the laser one..OH MY GOD!! Jigsaw is a mixed sequel with good things and bad things but at the end of the day,will Saw ever change?

6

From 2004 to 2010, we were greeted with a Saw film once every Halloween. Each film built on the foundation of the previous film, literally deeming them as iterations of one another. Now that time has past between films and new films and ideas have come out since then in the torture porn genre (I hate using that phrase, especially to describe the first film), new ground had to be broken. There are die-hard Saw fans like myself who know most every little intricacy of the first seven films, but nobody cares about the old formula anymore. It tired itself out. Instead of reiterating, it was now time to innovate. Enter co-writers Josh Stolberg & Pete Goldfinger and co-directors Michael & Peter Spierig, and in Halloween of 2017 you get Jigsaw.

All of this follows an eerily similar path to the Jurassic Park franchise. JP had sequels that, while in-name they hold their own, after a while started turn away some moviegoers and even got close to

jumping the shark if it continued down the beaten path. So they created some space between themselves for some years, and came back with a re-branding. Both films (Jigsaw and Jurassic World) serve as standalone films if you so want to treat them as such or jump into them anew, play off their respective first films in terms of content and paying proper homage, modernize themselves and play more to a general casual audience (Jigsaw domestically, JW globally), can and probably will churn out its own set of sequels, and let veterans of the franchises appreciate the small bits that played off any one of the previous installments. Jurassic World lives in a PG-13 setting though and caved in to more Hollywood tropes (including CGI), plus is a much higher budget film, but Jigsaw still breaks a lot of new ground that will not play familiarly to the Saw films of old.

When Darren Lynn Bousman jumped on board to direct Saw II, he noted in the commentary track what some of the 'staples' were for the franchise, including quick-cuts. While I don't agree with that assessment, this continued for his next two films in the franchise, and directors David Hackl and Kevin Greutert followed up with a similar format. The films also found themselves in flashback haven, remained almost exclusively within interior settings, and centralized a set of characters to connect within a small universe. Jigsaw opens up to the feeling that this is taking place in a larger city and environment, letting characters in and out of the games explore more and be realer people (in that they do not just serve the purpose of the film alone, like they have lives outside of what we see). The framing of the film has changed, the color palette has widened, Charlie Clouser's score is not as in-your-face, and the production simply doesn't feel as cheap. Right steps were made in making this film much more accessible, and I see this continuing in the future.

While Jurassic World actually seems to remove the sequels from canon (we will see if that's true with Jeff Goldblum's appearance in Fallen Kingdom), Jigsaw plays strongly in the sense that if you go without seeing, recalling, or keeping in mind Saw 4-7, you will be okay. Hoffman is completely out of the picture in Jigsaw, never once mentioned or concerned about. The only traits to be aware of in those films was that John lost a child, was once in a relationship with Jill Tuck, and there was an autopsy performed on his body. In fact, you could just as easily disregard specifics about Saw II and Saw III, and you will probably be okay. Knowing that John Kramer was killed in the third film just might be enough.

This one really mostly plays off the first film to be most effective, though. Aside from the elaborateness of the traps and games being made (which could transition more smoothly seeing the other seven films first), we can leave the first film understanding that a cancer-stricken individual puts victims in life-or-death scenarios because of moral sins they have committed, and if killed get a puzzle piece cut out of their bodies. Seasoned individuals will also find some of the twists in the new film somewhat predictable simply because they know

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

how Jigsaw thinks (or really, how the writers think). There were over a half-dozen twists, and I probably guessed or suspected the majority of them. Didn't make the film any inferior because I'm sitting and thinking about the casual moviegoer experiencing this film, and I think the best thing you can do for yourself now is at least see the first film and heck even at most know the outcome of the original trilogy. Saw IV, V, VI and The Final Chapter now all end up being fan-service flicks, unless any Jigsaw sequels end up coming back to them more than they have now.

I liked this movie. It could've been a complete garbage escapade like the seventh film was, and it wasn't. This reignites the franchise after it had stalled out and breathes fresh air. Maybe we will get a couple more within the next few Halloweens, because there is something to explore but I don't know how they'll want to do it. It is up to their creative bones now, and I like that facet of it because they can make good films if they try their darnedest in doing so.

If this film interests you enough that you want to give the first film a chance and haven't yet, go to Netflix right now to check it out, consider completing the original trilogy if you loved it enough to see what happens next, and check out this film when you're able to. I've reached my 1000-word limit, so now I'll just leave you here with my franchise ranking:

1, 3, 6, 2, J, 5, 4, 7

6

For me the best thing about sequel is the unity. Each one of them complete the others missing parts. This one is totally apart from the rest

About movie, thriller wasn't enough, traps wasn't excited, spilled blood wasn't enough.

Storyline seem like rushed, was weak. I expected much more. Was disappointing for me.

At the end i waited for "Game over" with shutted door. At least don't take it away from me right. But they did.

Worst one of the sequel for me . Sorry about that. It is disgrace for John's legacy.

By the way Laura Vandervoort your color is the brown thrust me "3C;3

1

Worst hour and a half of my life. That's all that needs to be said but since IMDb requires you to write 5 lines in a review I'll explain why. Firstly, it was horrible. I didn't find it thrilling at any point and the story line was just confusing and not good. I definitely could of written a better movie when I was in grade 3.

9

Even though people rarely admit it, the *Saw* series has been one of the highest quality horror series ever made. *Jigsaw* is the eighth entry in the series and there is still yet to be a bad film made amongst them. Some are undoubtedly better than others, but I defy you to point me out one that is inherently bad. I also defy you to show me another horror series (even any type of series at all is rare) that has maintained quality across that many films. That's why I was so happy that *Jigsaw* was a brilliant movie, because if they had come back seven years later only to put forward a bad film for the sake of making money it would have ruined everything. Luckily that was not the case though.

While this one does follow the formula used in all the past films, it also feels quite unique in a number of ways. The original seven films were all set within a very tight time-frame. This one of course is pushing ten years into the future. This adds layers of intrigue to the proceedings, because how could *Jigsaw* be committing these crimes when he died all those years back? And you just know they're going to have a brilliant answer to that question.

As far as the traps go in this one, I'm not too sure how I feel. None of them were bad, however none of them really blew me away either. My favourite one (without giving away any spoilers) was actually the most simple one in the film involving a gun. The psychology behind that one is what I loved. I love when these films aren't afraid to be intelligent.

The twist in this one also caught me completely off-guard. I've heard people say they weren't entirely convinced by it and felt that the film cheated, however I disagree. Nothing is off limits coming in a *Saw* movie. You have to know that going in. Altogether I absolutely loved this film and would thoroughly recommend it to anyone who is in anyway interested in the genre.

6

Saw has had many ups and downs as a series. The final chapter in 2010 was about as limp as soggy bread, giving us nothing shocking and a long-expected twist.

Jigsaw begins anew (don't expect Hoffman or Dr. Gordon to return) and features new characters and a new set of games. But...how can this be if John Kramer died over ten years ago? Is he really dead? He has to be. Right?

There are definite improvements here. The cinematography and production design is light years beyond the previous movies. I used to refer to *Saw* having *faketography* with some of the rudest, ugliest, and cheapest filters and color corrections ever to dirty the big screen. *Jigsaw*, being the first to be shot in 2.35:1, actually looks cinematic and it's the film's best feature. The games and traps themselves are gruesome but not overplayed, which took the focus away from torture porn and gave it a bit more of the psychological edge we got in the first movie.

Sadly, it fails elsewhere. The story gives us YET MORE cops, YET

MORE

coroners, and YET MORE doctors (all of them forgettable) filling up the side story. Sorry, but after a seven-year hiatus this should have been more unique and subversive. I gotta admit though, that twist ending had me kicking myself, and Charlie Clouser's score is as intense as ever.

Not a bad film, but not the huge comeback it should have been. I rank it somewhere in the middle of the series overall.

10

What can I say? As a huge SAW fan I was so exited for this movie. It didn't disappoint me at all! Great actors, great traps, gorgeous music.. And last but not least, a thrilling story and spine-chilling feeling through the whole movie! A golden comeback for the franchise! Great job Lionsgate!

5

I love the Saw movies don't get me wrong, but this movie although it was filmed very well and even had its funny cool moments just seemed like a repeat of something that was already seen. Do not get me wrong I loved seeing the new torture devices, but to see how each of them died and it ended up with no one winning, but finding out Jigsaw saved and trained another person seemed very predictable and overrated. I think this movie would have been awesome if turned out Jigsaw did not actually die and came back with an even more serious vengeance and did not give people a chance, but killed them in his own selective way and the last one to survive had a chance to save their own life. As far as the ending for this movie I thought was predictable and repeated. This movie could have been so much better.

10

Of course,its not my favorite part of this fantastic movie,BUT!I think everybody knows,that a lot of movies which has continuation, becoming more and more boring part by part.For example Pirates of Caribbean sea. i don't so like first 35m of movie.I saw it few hours ago,and at first 35 m i was thinking that - Oh no,please,lets something happen,because i have feeling,that it will be another movie,which makes me boring after his older parts,but this part,i can say,that makes me feel,what i was feeling after first,second and sixth parts...when you are starting to think after the end of movie....and for me this is one of the best continuation parts i have ever seen.Sure,there are a lot of not logical moments,but steel,for 8th part its brilliant work.Please make 9th part better....make Cramer alive,because you open that idea in 8th part....thank you for not boring continuation.

3

Right I am a big fan of this franchise... A real big fan so that when I was at the school I even made a film that is inspired by the franchise... Even though I am not proud of the film considering it was tight on budget and time Eventually it was shown at numerous film festivals around the world because it was catchy, commercial and current...

So last week after seeing Jigsaw I was shocked to see my plot being turned into feature length script,shot and presented to me in the cinema...

Some might call this as plot similarity which I doubt... As even the writers made the same mistakes as I did... (Those flat characters in Jigsaw... In a short film I had limited time to establish a character anyway)

Secondly Both mine and Jigsaw twists the time... Which is the main similarity... Which means the bodywork of the films are literally the SAME...

Second thing to note is at first those bucket heads did not mean a lot to me... Why they were there to begin with... Until I spot the first similarity about the plot...

Literally my work is inspired from ice bucket challenge... So you now know where those bucket heads are coming from...

Interesting coincidence one might even doubt if it is a coincidence or an indirect COPY & PASTE product...

you can check my short on youtube under Game Of Death Terms & Conditions short film if you are a writer it would be easy for you to understand the similarities...

let me know what you think...

9

This saw movie was actually one of the best ones. This movie had its scary moments and its funny moments, I give it a 9/10 because i have been waiting for a long time, I actually got to learn what happened after all these years but disappointing because Gordon and Hoffman weren't revealed. We still don't know what happened to them :(

9

If you love horror/thriller type of movies you must have seen at least one of Saw movies. It's been 7 years since the last Saw movie and with this one Jigsaw makes a great comeback. Like all Saw movies this one is also tied with the other ones and also gives you a new perspective about the previous ones. The plot looks simple at first. Looking like a classic John Kramer game where he wants justice and trying to teach a lesson to his chosen players. But as the movie continues it gets more complicated and it keeps you on the edge of your seat which is great. And as we get to climax part of the movie the legendary Saw music starts playing and all of the things that you are confused about is explained and you're just left with an open mouth. Because the plot twist is really good and a clever one. So i think this is a really must

see!!

6

Tyler Perry is something of an American phenomenon; a one-man motion picture industry. As a director, writer, or producer; and frequently all three; Perry since 2005 has been responsible for some twenty remarkably successful motion pictures. And that's in addition to the pictures of other filmmakers in which Perry has appeared only as an actor; popular films such as Star Trek, Alex Cross, and Gone Girl. To date, nine of Tyler Perry's twenty pictures as a producer, writer, or director have featured the character Madea, a plain-spoken and tough-loving elderly woman with a nurturing heart, a highly-acute antenna for the difference between right and wrong, and a penchant for involving herself in the troubles of other people. Madea, who's played in elaborate makeup and costuming by Perry himself, is based in equal measures upon the filmmaker's mother and aunt, and is partially inspired by the characterizations and performances by comic Eddie Murphy in the 2000 comedy The Nutty Professor II. Tyler Perry's comedies are remarkably accessible to filmgoing audiences. While the motion pictures of other filmmaking multi-taskers often appeal to an especially exclusive and rarefied demographic; Woody Allen springs to mind; Perry's movies are popular entertainment for anyone who loves to laugh. Unfortunately, Boo 2! is not among Perry's best pictures; or even among his best Madea pictures. While the laughs are there, especially for Perry's legions of fans and Madea aficionados, they're more sparse than usual, and less frequent. Both the filmmaker and the character he created seem to be going through the motions by rote, and without heart. Boo 2! is enjoyable enough. But audiences unfamiliar with Tyler Perry or Madea might find themselves wondering what all the fuss is about.

6

Hellur! Tyler Perry's signature character has made her mark for so many years, teaching lessons in her own unique manner. These movies have come in all sorts of scenarios, many being close carbon copies of the predecessors that laid the foundation. This series continues to rope loyal fans into the theater though, never tiring of the gimmicks cooked up at Perry Studios. Tonight, the sequel to Madea's Halloween tale emerges, in hopes of mimicking the success it brought not long ago. What's the verdict? Robbie K, here asking you to read on to find out his opinions.

LIKES:

Familiarity: When it comes to Madea, you don't expect much deviation from the formula, a comforting factor indeed. Perry's writing doesn't try to be anything it's not, and that nets some respect in bringing the

laughs that make so many laugh. And if you're a fan of this series, you'll have nothing to fear in regards to the comedy at hand (as evidenced by many people howling with laughter in my showing.)

Plenty of Madea: Some Madea movies don't do give the mad lady her adequate screen time, choosing instead to go for a more drama (soap opera like) plot. Boo 2 is more than happy to give you a Madea fix, with much of the 100-minute run time staying on our protagonist. She leads much of the banter, and her insults are more than enough to keep things engaging alongside her older colleagues. So, for a movie promising Madea, this film delivers on this aspect as well.

Fast Pace: Another positive for Boo 2 is that the movie doesn't dawdle when it comes to getting to the laughs. A small, simplistic opening makes way to the comedy at hand, taking less than 20 minutes to get to the first bout of Madea running her mouth. Once that first joke flies, the movie continues at a steady pace and creating the effect of time flying (seriously had no idea an hour had passed). This leads to an entertaining environment that is simply fun on many levels, that's right no complicated thinking in this film.

Joe: By far the best part of the movie for me is Madea's brother Joe. While his sexually harsh jokes, lack of respect for others, and intense focus on drugs are not my main source of humor, this character has some of the best comedic moments of the movie. His timing is well- executed, and his lines are just harsh enough to offset the bickering this movie holds within. The piece de resistance though, is how well Perry delivers that gruff edge in his humor to maximize the punch of the line and keep the laughs fresh. I found myself laughing the most with his scenes and was glad to see more Joe in this film.

DISLIKES:

Unoriginal: Familiarity is fun and entertaining, but it is also lacking the original twist I like to see in the films. Every Madea film has a slight twist to it, but this film is too much a copy of the first Halloween movie that the tactics are fairly stale. Had it not been for the comedic timing at some parts of the movie, the bantering would have gotten much staler as the old folks complained about the same things consistently. This dislike also goes to the fact that Madea's jokes are losing favor with me, especially when they drop the morals for incoherent babbling and arguing.

The College Kids: If you read my last Madea review, you know the college kids didn't impress me. Sadly, this movie managed to make me loathe these characters even more. Rather than giving the younger characters some admirable qualities, outside of superficial looks, Perry crafted them to be the same, shallow, annoying selves they were in the past, only much worse. The fraternity brother are even hornier, stupid meatheads with little contribution to the movie. Leah (Lexy Panterra) is reduced to a squabbling airhead, who does little, but flash off her own body with overacted gestures and a skin-tight leopard shirt. Yet, the worst character goes to Tiffany (Diamond White) the arrogant brat who supposedly learned her lesson last time. After all

the punishing blows, the hotheaded teen hasn't learned a thing and has fallen back into the same annoying qualities I despised in the first film. What's even more pathetic, is that they don't use her selfishness very well to drive a moral filled plot, but just as a tool for more jokes. Sadly, this movie doesn't give the satisfying punch that its predecessor accomplished.

No story: Boo 2's other major dislike for me is that lack of a story.

It's true, the movie runs at a quick pace and is entertaining, but the trailers have tricked you into thinking there is a story. This particular Madea story is the lamest story of the bunch, with only a hair thin plot to ground the comedy too. Past this skeletal frame, the movie is only about cramming the most jokes into the run time, which also took away from the Madea formula.

The VERDICT:

Boo 2 is a sequel that accomplishes the goal of making you laugh with the same familiar tactics Perry has capitalized on for the last decade. It's simple fun, fast paced humor will keep fans howling in delight, while also welcoming a new age in with its simplicity. Yet, I found this movie to be the weakest of the installments, particularly due to the unbalanced characters and lack of story to guide the mischief better. Safe to say this movie is meant for home viewing pleasure where you can enjoy the banter and insults with better snacks and bathroom privileges.

My scores:

Comedy/Horror: 7.0 Movie Overall: 5.0

6

While the first. Madea boo offered a decent amount of laughs but I found the sequel to be somewhat lacking, while the movie features the return of fan favorites Madea, Joe, Bam and Hattie Mae but it felt like the similar tone of the first despite being the tenth Madea film. Brian's ex wife Deborah makes a return appearance since diary of a mad black woman, but played by a different actress.

2

I would have loved it if the prank was for real. How Madea would react when scared for real.

What I didn't like : 1. Joe is too much and is no longer funny.

The teenager with her friend, were very boring.

The whole movie was disappointing.

The turn around of the ex wife was very not genuine. I would have loved to have seen more drama on that and also when Perry heard that his ex allowed the daughter to go for a party, I have loved Tyler not to be part of the prank and also Tyler not to let the daughter go easy. Bottom line drama was not there and the bit that was there was not interesting.

1

OK, when are people who think Madea is funny going to wake up and see

this is just a bad story, writing, directing and acting all in one movie. I would have preferred to watch 10 hours straight of PBS, just so I can get back whatever brain cells were sucked out while having to sit through this debacle. It was not funny!! The actors were one dimensional. The jokes were either sexist or racist. The plot was stupid. Take my advice, stay away from Perry's movies. He has become one of the bloated, bad directors that Hollywood should be ashamed of and they should be ashamed for ever making these types of movies. With so many good choices in steaming, cable and other movies it is hard to believe people would go to this heap of a movie. By the way, the only reason we went is we got free passes and it was still a rip off!!

3

Concur with other reviewers! Definitely not worth paying full price for. If it wasn't Tyler Perry, I would believe it was just a money grab?? Oddly, my family and many of the audience laughed a lot but not his best work and not half as funny as original. Even Hattie couldn't save this one, sniff sniff

2

This was not his best, even earlier ones, Father's straying to profanity and vulgar, adults left early and families with kids met us in the lobby. Tone it down and balance the racial references. Disappointed at this one. Maby this was the one too many with same line, two new characters added did not fit. Fresh dialog and tone down Father. Summary, We will still support he and his characters.

5

So as far as sequels go, this is a very typical one. I went to see Boo 2 because though Tyler Perry movies are not really my thing, I actually enjoined the first Boo, so I took the chance that I would enjoy the second one.

I totally did, too. It's not as good as the original. As much as I

found the original funny, it also had an attempt to show family values in it that was not lost on me. This time around their attempt (If there was one cause I did not see it) was literally taken out to make more room for laughs. In a lot of ways it made the film like the second episode of one of Perry's shows (Which I like more than his movies), as it seems nobody learned the lesson from the first Madea Halloween.

Case in point, like the original, Boo 2 is about Joe trying to discipline his entitled daughter, Tiffany. Once again she defies her overbearing father's wishes in order to go to a party at midnight in the woods at a camp where a bunch of people got murdered. Now I understand the natural urge for a teenager not to want to listen to her dad, but when your aunt is someone like Madea, you would think you

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

would think twice about this woman coming to track you down, especially after what happen in the last movie.

Like the last film, Boo 2 focuses on Madea and her friends running into terror and danger while trying to get to Tiffany. The film likes to Parody current themes in horror like with influences of Korean horror and it also pokes a nod to old school Horror with the film taking place at a camp and the underage teens being hunted by a man with a mask and a chainsaw.

Overall, I much prefer the more light hearted Tyler Perry movies. Sometimes his stuff can be too over dramatic for me, but I seem to like it when he goes for straight up Sitcom style on us and that's Boo 2!

It's crazy and filled with laughs and no matter where it fails compare to the first one, we are there to laugh and that's what makes this sequel enjoyable.

<http://cinemagardens.com/?p=1756>

1

Firstest of all DA haters can just get shook off. #shakeemoff

Tyler Perry is both DA funniest man and woman simultaneously in dis film y'all.

I was luffing so hard i almost choked on mu popcorn yo but also dis movie is also Hakka scurry yo, Dem jump scares had me like "oh snap" but Madea handled DAT stuff, yo go girl and den also you give it up to DA jay man in the sky #blessesed

i hope they make 8 mo sequels because dis was tight.

Mr.Perry this is the fan base you appeal to, At very least this is what you imagine the mindset of your audience to be.

Your films are modern day minstrel shows and as Madea you personify every negative stereotype that exists in black culture. Nothing about what you do or say is even remotely funny.

I wonder on occasion if through the piles of cash and the turbid veil of Hollywood, If you take the time to look at yourself in the mirror before you inevitably shuck and jive your way through another film.

3

Let me just say that for the record, I'm not a Madea fan, I am just a casual moviegoer. But that doesn't mean I can't get enjoyment out of these movies.

Last year, I saw Boo! A Madea Halloween. I thought it was okay. Sure, some of the comedy scenes dragged on and on and there were some stupid moments, but I overall thought it was an alright movie. I thought it was way better than the other comedy I saw that year, Why Him.

But one year later, we get this movie. Hoo boy.

Now, when I heard that they were making ANOTHER Madea Halloween movie

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

one year after they already did one, I thought to myself, "Why? Didn't they just do one?" But then, I was like, "Whatever. Maybe something new is in store."

When I heard the plot of this movie, I thought it sounded like the laziest sequel ever.

When I saw the movie, I was right.

I did not enjoy this film. The plot was the SAME EXACT THING as the last film. (Spoiler alert) That teenage girl goes to yet ANOTHER party with those frat guys, somehow not learning her lesson from last time, and surprise surprise, something supernatural happens. How lazy and uninspired can you get? Oh, and if you weren't there for the first Halloween movie, don't worry. The characters will be happy to mention it constantly. And just like the last film, some scenes with Madea and her friends talking drag. But it's shorter this time around. That's good. Some parts of this movie were stale, like a lot of scenes featured the same thing happening: Madea and the gang are in their car and something jumps out at them and scares them. Rinse and repeat. A lot of the characters got really annoying, especially Madea's brother, Joe, who I swear, always had something to say whenever a sentence was uttered. Further contributing to the film's laziness, the moral (if you will) from Boo 1 was the same, but it was with the mom instead of the dad. It wasn't really built up like last time, it was just rushed. And speaking of the parents, you'd think that after the father learned his lesson in the predecessor, that he'd be getting back together with his ex wife or something. But nope. He's still divorced, and his ex wife hooked up with another bald dude. Oh, and do you wanna know the twist in this movie? Well, get this... The father was behind all the ghosts and demons scaring away the kids. Yep. Just like last time where the father had involvement with the fake arrest thing. Pitiful. Absolutely pitiful. And oh yeah, the film ends on somewhat of a cliffhanger, where (spoiler alert) it turns out that one of the creatures that haunted the kids was actually real. Oh, please don't do a Boo 3. I hope this was only a joke.

But through all the bad things this film had to offer, there were some things that I liked. A diamond in the rough, if you will. But it's more like a diamond in the litter box. I liked the return of Yousef Ereka. He was funny in the last one and was quite funny in this one. Also, that scene where Madea is in the police station and sees herself on a "Wanted" poster was pretty funny. (How the cops don't recognize her is beyond me.) But that scene seemed to drag, as well. But those things could not save the movie.

Overall, this was a disappointment. It had little effort thrown into it and was basically a retread of the first Madea Halloween movie. I do not recommend it... Unless you're a hardcore Madea fan and need to see everything that this character is in.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

(sent from my Iphone3) Good day Madea fans! I am writing this review from my seat in the theater, having just watched B002 3 times. Let me say this, this movie is a keeper! Don't let those snoozy reviews throw you off! You have to see this movie! From the opening credits to the last sound, this movie will keep you on edge. That Madea cat is something else and I have to say, my B002 Tshirt, just ordered from Amazon.com, is inbound as of yesterday! OK, back to the movie. B002 will keep you howling throughout, and if you are looking to be tricked? Have no fear as this movie is a treat! Get your popcorn, treat it with some hot saux, and sit back and relax. You will not be disappointed. B002 is not a Boo Hoo.

5

. . . and not in any good way. It's as if Harvey Weinstein, Bill Cosby, and O.J. Simpson have gotten together to remake THE HUMAN CENTIPEDE. Writer/Director/Boom Operator Tyler Perry peppers B00 2 with the N-Word as he mocks Transgendered Folks, Christians, Wiccans, and Family Values. Maybe his Simmons Family and their three generations of prostitutes is enough of a lame joke to carry ONE film, but certainly not 43. A typical sample gag from B00 2 is Pops Brian Simmons encouraging his slutty daughter Tiffany--who's dressed so she'd fit right in on the cover of about half of Mr. Perry's 1980s VHS tape Porno Collection--to dance the Peeing Dog at a Fire Hydrant, The Sprinkler, and The Toilet Seat. Mr. Perry needs to realize that for every Human Action, Nature requires an Equal and Opposite Reaction. The Blue-Man Pict and Green Leprechaun Races offered THEIR versions of B00 2 just before Humanity was compelled to eradicate them. (When's the last time that a Blue Dude or a Green Witch plopped down next to YOU at the theater? Think about it.) B00 2 very well could become the provocation that brings a similar Fate Down Upon Perry's People!

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

1

The 3D special effects for this movie were fantastic. The screenplay was so bad that it became a comedy, probably better than some comedies I have seen recently. Literally the audience was laughing out loud. All of the trite lines were there. But more disturbing was the not so cloaked attempt by Hollywood to get their message across:

1. The Democratic President is a hero. 2. His Secretary of State, a USA isolationist who wants to destroy American's enemies before they destroy us, is the bad guy. At least Ed Harris didn't try to look like Trump. 3. A self-driving car was the escape vehicle. 4. Global climate change is real and so bad (2019) that it could destroy the world. 5. The strong blond sexy female Secret Service agent could (and does) out do any man. Don't mess with her, she will shoot you dead. 6. Males need to bond more. They need to be soft and caring and their early boyhood competitiveness can destroy sibling relationships.. 7. An Iranian (by the flag on his uniform) is one of the villains, but in the end the Arabs of Dubai are saved. 8. A Mexican is the one who ultimately saves the overly masculine protagonist and the strong German female partner (Ach Du Lieber). The Mexican savior literally points to the flag on this sleeve at the end of the movie. 9. A precious precocious little girl looks forward to saving the future of the planet.

Not that I disagree with any of these principles necessarily but goodness. I haven't seen a propaganda movie like this in a LONG time. Based on the trailers, it obviously is supposed to appeal to males... so get them in the seats and let the sermons begin. Hollywood... please. All that money should have been given to the starving children around the world. Imagine how far it would go!

8

Wow, the critics went to town on this film didn't they.

Although this film wasn't close to perfect, it doesn't deserve such a low score.

My main negative critique was that the writing/screenplay was a little sloppy, although still very entertaining.

But either than that, the performances were decent, the cinematography/sfx well done and the directing was good.

An enjoyable film

that I would see again maybe one more time, but certainly not deserving of such a low score.

7

This is an action-packed movie that will entertain you; and you will feel pretty okay about what you've just witnessed.

Very nice special effects. The storms were nicely done. CGI was convincing.

Why I think this works better than other "Natural Disaster" films is because they did not revolve the plot around the storms...the storms were just the vehicle of destruction used. It's more like a Live Free Or Die Hard conspiracy, but instead of hi-jacking the IoT, they are hi-jacking weather control satellites.

Good CGI, a fun movie.

7/10

*Had Bruce Willis been in it... would have made it an 8.5

7

In Geostorm, Earth is beset by natural disasters. In facing adversity, mankind developed a satellite station to prevent these catastrophes. While people overcame this problem, another conflict arises when it becomes opportune to use the technology as a weapon for sole global domination.

The setting in which the story takes place, you can say, parallels our own at the present in which we are experiencing technological advancements which perks we use to solve our crises but also create further dilemma as countries individually vie to be the world superpower.

Going to see the movie, I wasn't expecting much for it because it seemed like a so-so movie that's probably been done before only re-released with a "semi different plot" under a different title. But I was surprised by how entertaining it is. There's the timeliness of its subject, there's definitely humor (which is funny but I thought they somehow overdid with some of the dialogue) but this one has also dramatic scenes that would touch you. The pathos really got me emotionally involved with what the characters are experiencing. This aspect I really enjoyed.

The downside, I can still say that it seems a lot of it's contents were borrowed from/ inspired by previous natural disaster/sci-fi flicks such as Day After Tomorrow (look at one of its posters for instance), Armageddon, and Gravity to name a few. This might be a turnoff for moviegoers who are expecting originality and it will most likely be so but for me, I got over it and had myself a good time in the cinema. It is definitely not the best movie this year or ever but its up there with the good, entertaining ones I really enjoyed watching this year.

10

When the network of satellites designed to control the global climate start to attack Earth, it's a race against the clock to uncover the real threat before a worldwide geostorm wipes out everything and everyone. Geostorm is one of those films that i didn't expect to go see on the Big Screen or even like in general. Unlike past disaster films this one is actually more grounded and more realistic in it's own way and it's not some volcano or an earthquake it's actually humans that pull the strings here. The acting is also impressive by everyone from Gerard Butler to Abbie Cornish to Andy Garcia and beyond. The cgi are top notch with a lot of impressive and beautiful shots of cities falling down or entire buildings and airplanes. It also goes a bit dramatic during the end and i gotta say it does touch you on those feelings, there's also comedy of course and although not every joke hits some of them are actually pretty great and even when it's slow a bit it picks right after especially the last 30 to 35 minutes are action packed, special effects nerdgasm. Thanks to an all star talented cast, impressive cgi and some heartfelt moments Geostorm is an action packed popcorn flick that some people will love and some others won't it depends on your own personal taste and if you like this kind of movies in general but if you enjoyed films such as 2012, Armageddon, Volcano, San Andreas and Dante's Peak you won't be disappointed.

1

I don't know who keeps asking movies about natural disasters, but Independence Day: Resurgence, 2012, San Andreas, among others, proved that it's not a very good idea. But as long as the majority likes it, who am I to judge?

OK, let's begin. Gerard Butler plays a man who saves our planet from natural problems, storms, cold winters, with the help of a space station, zZzZzZzZzZz.

Geostorm is so full of CGI, that at one point you start to get headaches and you'll never understand what's behind the desire of destroying the planet. It has something to do with the White House, I didn't catch the idea because I felt asleep for a short period of time.

If you want a film full of disasters that are also eye-candy, Geostorm is not the best idea. The movie is the same as other disaster flicks, nothing new. I believe the writer wrote the script in 2-3 days.

If you want something mindless, with a total waste of talent, full of cliché's and loud sounds, Geostorm is the perfect choice.

8

I noted a few "rubbish" reviews, they seem to have been watching some other movie. This has a pretty good premise (with actually possible science), and some excellent action and effects. I felt I got my ticket's worth, no question.

I would have rated it higher but there is a bit of cheesy voice-over at

the end and some slightly clichéd dialogue I wasn't in love with. still, those are minor flaws, and for somebody wanting a good weekend popcorn action movie, you will not be disappointed. plus Butler has a few great lines you will really enjoy.

8

I was pleasantly surprised how good this movie really is. I tend to like disaster movies so I may have given it extra stars than some. I gave it a strong 8 for the story line and the special effects. At times there were cheesy scenes but that is just the nature of the beast. Hollywood does it's best making these style movies as real as possible. Looking back at Volcano and Dante's Peak even those were done well for their time. It was nice to see Ed Harris and Andy Garcia in a movie too, seems like these guys take big breaks between movies. So without going on and on I recommend this movie for disaster buffs like myself.

1

I found this film to be very sleep worthy, in fact I had to check the plot afterwards as I kept dozing off. Very cheesy American human interest story about the relationship between two brothers was its central theme. The sci-fi was badly thought out and made Gerry Anderson look like an expert. The highlight for me was when the baddie was revealed to be a disciple of Trump. I left the cinema muttering 'we should have invested more in renewable energy'.

2

I was really looking forward to see this movie after I saw trailer for it. Oh, how I was wrong. I can't remember when have I seen such a bad movie in every aspect of it. Stupid dialogues, bad acting, really shallow plot... And of course, how can we bypass politics from real life... In movie, several countries participate in making the technology for saving Earth, but no Russians, they are bad, they don't want to save planet where they live... Really... Puke... At least I've collected a lots of points on my Cinema bonus card, so I watched it for free...

2

When the movie ended, the 8 year old behind me said, 'That's the end? Mom, they didn't show the Geostorm!' and I kid you not, he started to cry.

I can totally relate. We came to see destruction, that kid and I! To see a disaster film! But, frankly, the only disaster here is the script.

First of all, the whole first 45 minutes could have been skipped. Frankly, no one cares about Gerald Butler and his relationship with his brother. (That whole plot line plays out like a lack-luster

tele-novela.) And Jim Sturgess is so bad, the less we see of him actually talking the better. (I spent the whole movie thinking how much better it would have been if Sturgess's role had been played by Zazie Beetz. Zazie Beetz as the sister in the white house. Zazie Beetz having an affair with Secret Service agent Abbie Cornish... Now that would have been interesting...)

This is how they SHOULD have done it: Start the movie with the Geostorm clock. Right off the bat: count down to destruction! Weather going crazy! Mayhem!

Gerry Butler arrives to fix it. A German lady helps but everything starts to blow up. Meanwhile, Zazie and Abbie are racing around with the president shooting bad guys!

65% of the planet is destroyed! (For real! Even the dog!) But our heroes still pull it off, even though Ed Harris turns out to be the really wicked bad guy. (Isn't it ALWAYS Ed Harris?)

But surprise! The traitor on the space station is not the French guy! It's the skinny English guy who needs a shower! Gerry finally gets to beat someone up. (But it does look like he's beating up a 14 year old. Its kind of creepy, really.)

After killing the teen-aged brit and stopping the countdown at 1, Gerry and the German scientists are saved by a Space Mexican. (Literally the only good part of the movie is the Space Mexican.)

At no moment do we hear anything about Gerry's feelings. He is childless, so we are spared the horrible acting of the daughter. There is no whooshing, clunking or explosion sounds in the space scenes BECAUSE IT IS A VACUUM. There are some actual futuristic cars to go with all of the space shuttles and the fancy smart phones. Gerald Butler talks like a normal person and not guy in a bar in South Boston. (They could have named the movie "Southies in Space"!) Most importantly: THERE IS AN ACTUAL GEOSTORM!

No Geostorm. No movie. For real.

2

This was bad.... really bad! I am a big disaster movie fan and can sit through most things, but wow this was really boring.. the characters are shallow, predictable and the chemistry between them stilted and forced.

The special effects were OK, but you just didn't get any sense of the fear because there was no character that developed enough for you to fear for them.

I think a better movie would have been Gerard Butler developing the satellite system and saving the world from Global Warming in the first place.. at least that may have been believable.

I watched Geo Disaster on Syfy the other day and at the time was thinking that it would be a poor mans Geostorm.. but seriously it turned out to be the better of the two films.. that should tell you just how dreadful this film was. It only gets 2 because the special effects were OK.

1

THERE IS NO GEOSTORM! Only a family drama and bad acting, some nice CGI effects about tornados at Asia, tsunami on Dubai (shit), cool climate changes at Rio de Janeiro (who are those people there? they don't look Brazilians), a lovely drama about a couple working at government, the conspiracy government that is not fault of the great president of that great united states of America (terrorists are always from other countries).

Tell me why the guy is so invincible? He goes to space, explodes a big station, and can survive everything! But he is a bad father to his daughter... oh no! If someone liked this movie and gave it some good 10 score, of course he was paid for it! No way!

2

I went to see Geostorm because it was the only movie playing on a night where I really wanted to go to the 4D-cinema. Since it was a disaster movie I figured it would go well with the big screen and the 4D-effects.

Right from start I felt that something was off. The dialogue and over all atmosphere felt tacky and the acting didn't seem genuine. This was only the beginning though.

Geostorm is filled with canned dialogue and clichés that will make you cringe. Most of the actors under perform and there's no real chemistry between the main actors.

During the whole movie you feel like you're watching a movie that you've already seen and the tropes used are so in-your-face that you almost feel provoked.

I was thinking about leaving several times during the movie but since I was with friends I decided to stay. During the climax of the movie several people in the audience were loudly mocking the movie and laughing at the absurdity of it all.

Everything about Geostorm was a disaster. It was very predictable and preachy and the director actually made you feel dumb throughout most of the movie. The only OK thing was the CGI but even that felt re-used and tired.

Nobody should watch this movie. It's utterly bad and should be avoided at any cost. I don't even want to think about how much money was spent on this garbage

1

Hollywood is officially DEAD! They have run out of ideas and keep recycling the same trash over and over all the while shoving their far-left liberal politics down the throats of a fed-up public whose beginning to wake up. This sorry piece of CGI crap with a terrible

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

script and actors who seemed like they phoned their performances in is what Hollywood calls entertainment to the masses nowadays. Don't waste your money or time on this turkey.

8

Probably because of the weak marketing campaign, I don't hear much of Geostorm, and I watched it last night with low expectation.

And Woow!!! I did not expect to see it coming. It was so Good!! The Weather technology used in this movie are very detailed. I love how Geostorm makes this sci-fi movie into a thrill mystery. I love to see the chemistry between Jim Sturgess and Abbie Cornish. The only lacking here is the development between Jim Sturgess and Gerard Butler character.

While waiting for the big movie at the end of the year, Geostorm is definitely must watch.

9

I went for this movie since my wife likes watching movies with this theme. The Day after tomorrow or Apocalypse themed movies where nature is destroying everything. This movie surprisingly had more to offer. It has a fantastic suspenseful plot. The two main protagonists Gerard Butler and Jim Strugess are brothers. They have fantastic chemistry and the story unfolds brilliantly. The special effects are awe-inspiring. A great effort. Loved it.

6

Plot Spoiler review? Extreme weather is killing the planet. Satellites around the globe are equipped to control the weather by shooting little pellets. It is controlled by a space station with the system designed by Jake Lawson (Gerald Butler). When the space station malfunctions, causing sharknados or something, only Gerald Butler pretending to be Mel Gibson can save the world...with the help from his brother (Jim Sturgess) who he must reconnect with to make a good personal story. It is quickly discovered it is sabotage and there is a mystery as to who would do this...unless you have ever seen a Scooby-doo episode, then you have it figured out. Are you smarter than a fifth grader? The science aspect of science fiction lacked explanation as to how they were able to control air pressure with pellets or the gravity maker which nearly every space film has, but in reality is not feasible any time soon...which is why NASA isn't working on one. The science fiction is more fiction than science. The mystery aspect wasn't really a mystery so we are left with a passable thriller with some light moments, mostly provided by Adepero Oduye.

Guide: No swearing, sex or nudity.

3

Geostorm

fixating on the inner politics i.e. behind the stage was a wise choice rather than wasting the time with the vfx explosion which still doesn't mean that it's a promising movie as it contains lots of flaws and a poor writer.

2

This movie is one of those lame Sci-Fi movies with one difference. Good actors and good CGI. But what the hell in the world was that script?! I don't know any movie that caught me literally sleeping in cinema.

Anyways, script was so cliché; that there was nothing unexpected there. And this is story not about Armageddon or anything similar, this is a story of 2 brothers, who fight with each other and 'good' and ofc 'bad'; guys. There is also so much nonsense, people are using gasoline cars, but they are able to deploy millions of satellites and make net over whole damn earth.

Rockets are like deployed every day, multiple times, by not new tech, but current rocket system, which is unbelievable stupid.

He is sitting in a rocket the same way like when you would go to supermarket to buy groceries, just turn on and fly to the space.

And let's forget all these things, but the thing that HE BUILT THE NET is most amazing stupidity in the movie.

There is one good, and one bad guy. Why people cannot be good and bad at same time in this kind of cliché movies. The 'bad' guy is destroying world intentionally. This can be compared to a guy who tries to open a packaged food can with a nuclear bomb. This is nothing.

I ignored even nonsense about instant weather changes, where people are burning and out of sudden, just 2 meters away there is normal temperature and there is NO WIND. Whoever cooked the soup know that soup starts moving in all directions on temperature change, similar goes with the air. but, author of this script doesn't understand that. With this budget he SHOULD KNOW that almost everyone knows the basics of physics. But let's forget even this.

The thing that during the movie you figure out the resolution of conversation after 10-30 seconds, but conversation lasts for another 10 minutes. This made me so bored that I couldn't watch it. This killed, destroyed and vanished all my will to watch movie.

Terrible, very very stereotypical American, physics taken from some other universe and truly awful. Popcorns in cinema was best entertainment, and games on my phone.

1

WARNING - CONTAINS PROGRESSIVE PROPAGANDA AND OTHER SPOILERS

I like disaster movies. I like good CGI when it serves a purpose. I like good acting and memorable characters. What I don't like is Leftist, Liberal Propaganda shoved in my face as not only as a plot element, but the entire movie script as well! I thought that this was supposed to be an entertaining Sci-Fi Disaster Flick. Here are the main points for you to consider: 1.) CAGW is not only real, but it will happen TOMORROW; 2.) Only Democrat Presidents are Good; 3.) Technology is so flawed, that any idiot can take it over for nefarious purposes; 4.) The World can Unite under the United Nations to produce Great Feats of Global Engineering; and 5.) CGI can bail out a Horrible Film. Frankly, I am getting so tired of Political Viewpoints infecting Sci-Fi and Action Films. If you want to do Political Propaganda Films, please make them International Thrillers or Dramas or something other than Blatantly Obvious, In Your Face, Left Wing Political statements. And if you want to do a Climate related Disaster Film, don't repeat the already used and absurd "Instant Mr. Freeze" effect that can't be performed without dumping a cryogenic fluid on someone or somehow causing an airplane to fall out of the sky by instantly freezing the aircraft without suddenly encasing it in a solid block of ice! Been there, Done that already. Now, if you want to use a form of EMP attack, at least it would be believable. Suffice it to say, that like many recent feature films that have been ruined by inserting political garbage as a major plot element, Geostorm should be avoided at all costs, unless you are a die hard Al Gore lunatic!

7

Geostorm is pretty much as good as a disaster film can get. The SFX & VFX are phenomenal, the acting is good, the story line is a bit silly, but most disaster movie plots are.

Geostorm isn't as good as Into The Storm, but is better than San Andreas.

This is a movie for the big screen, if you like disaster films then you should go and see Geostorm.

9

We've all seen such movies where mankind is facing certain destruction. Countless movie titles and countless resembling points. Seems all the available ideas have been taken and put to use, but it doesn't mean that a movie cannot be intriguing or thrilling.

Geostorm has the all-knows scenario - series of events strike the Earth, lots of people die and bunch of heroes try their best to save them all.

But the story and action are very well made. It's dramatic, suspenseful, sometimes funny with some nice touches. The effects are good, well not like Avatar or The Avengers, but still realistic. I'd even say that the acting is very good.

Assets and flows, leave them behind,

I find the movie really cool and I don't regret watching it.

9

This movie surprised the hell out of me and so did the rest of the audience(there was genuine applause at the end of the movie). Before watching I'd read some negative reviews, thankfully I ignored them and decided to watch it. The entire movie is directed well, despite the the difficult theme and message it delivers. I must say if it weren't for the beautiful flow to the movie and some good performances from the actors this would've flopped. I don't want to give you any hints which could be a spoiler alert, but there are two very important messages it delivers: 1) Do not mess with nature. 2) Regardless of race, religion, color etc, the planet and also the cosmos is one!

10

Critics are not fair once again. This movie was very good, I loved it. Gerard Butler nailed it and so did the men and women on his team. I was on the edge of my seat throughout the movie. There were some funny lines that the audience enjoyed too. There was drama, sadness, action. I will be seeing this one again. The story lines all blended together very well.

4

When you watch the trailer of "Geostorm";, you can easily get excited by the stunning VFX and ultra catastrophic incidents (Mega Tsunami, etc.). However, after watching the full movie, you realize that they have packed the trailer with all the action scenes, so expect nothing new at the theater. Unlike "2012";, this movie has a far less reasonable plot or intense scenes, the science behind it is also kind of a joke compared to similar titles. Unfortunately, it is one of those consumer movies where the protagonist arguably saves the world at the last second of a countdown. The movie ISN'T BAD though, it has a good package of this and that, it just doesn't meet the fan high expectations following its propaganda.

5

I had been waiting for this movie since the first trailer I saw early in the year. I have to be honest in that I walked out before the end as I had seen it (a similar ending) 1000 times before in other movies. And I didn't care enough about the story or characters to stick around. The ending is just ridiculous in the same mold as Gravity and Passengers. I like Sci-Fi as much as anyone but not when it gets too impossible to even kind of believe it then I can't take it. I have to have some

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

thread of reality to cling to.****Spoiler Alert**** At the end when the space station is disintegrating and millions of little parts are blasting all over the vicinity the 2 space walkers are just bouncing along hard into sharp type objects and somehow avoiding said millions of pieces of shrapnel any one of which would have ended their joyous space waltz forever.....couldn't take.....oh well....."He made a promise" gimme a break! other spfx were well done....not the end

6

The idea behind this movie is good, but the realization is awful.

The movie failed because of the director, who appears to be pretty bad at being a director. He tried to create a good science fiction but ended up creating something that reminded me of the second part of Independence Day (which was an awful science fiction). Another thing that ruined this movie was the poorly written script, which was also written by this incompetent director.

However there are a few things that make this movie not that bad. They tried to get rid of the "The USA saves the world" cliché (they failed, but hey - at least they tried). The idea behind the movie was good and original. But as I already said the director and the bad acting of the actors (which is also the director's fault) ruined it.

This movie had the potential of becoming a great science fiction, such as Interstellar and The Martian but only if it was directed by a more talented person. Still I give this movie 6 out of 10, simply because the idea was original and managed to unite fiction and catastrophe into one. Too bad they failed to find a decent director, who will be able to make this idea into a masterpiece.

10

Best movie ever...

Brilliant 3D & 4D work....

Worth Watching a nice movie after long time...

The 3 D & 4 D effects are mind blowing.

I would strongly recommend every one to watch this movie...

7

After reading the reviews nearly passed on Geostorm but having enjoyed a few movies critics have panned and vice versa decided to brave the storm (sorry) and risk it. Despite some clunky script at times & stereotyping I settled down to a film i found not so much a disaster movie but more a race against time mystery/thriller. And in that light I quite enjoyed it.

The film is saved by some strong female characters (including Gerard's daughter who manages to convincingly resemble my own 12 year old - a mixture of plain speaking childhood vulnerability and strong common sense) plus a concept thats half believable, if hugely depressing (in

light of recent weather disasters). The special effects are pretty good. Perhaps we r spoiled and have seen too many Days after Tomorrow and 2012s to appreciate them anymore.

7

Just to get it out of the way the science on Geostorm is... not good. It reminds me of The Core or Armageddon. You just have to accept it and move on, I feel it unjust to judge the movie on something that they obviously put little emphasis on.

The basic idea is that is that thanks to global warming we needed a net of weather control satellites (literal a net, as in they are connected in space) to keep weather from being insanely bad. They start going bad and doing stuff like freezing an Afgan village, or cooking part of a city like a microwave. Two brothers try and find out what is going on a fix it. One goes to orbit the other stays on earth. It had two threads and many characters and used them well. It's a spy thriller with a large dose of a natural disaster movie thrown in. I could have done without the environmental message but it did not really get in the way, also the science was so ridicules that you could not really take it seriously.

www.JoshuaLawrencePike.com

7

Predictable, but my mom likes this movie as she shed tears. I don't know why Max hates Jake so. Better if Max & Jake didn't have any issue before Jake was fired, then they're off over 5 years, until Dutch Boy went rogue. And Max, if it is Jim Sturgess's style, why is so rushy since beginning, he should have been a calm person, with neat haircut.

6

Poorly Written Poorly Executed Poorly Acted Too many plot lines Very predictable

I went to see this film at the cinema with some friends to celebrate the end of a term, and I found it shocking that the ADS were more enjoyable than the film. Of course, my friends and I talked through the ads, making fun of them, and that's what made them enjoyable. We also talked through the actual FILM, but we found that there was too much to talk about, because it was so boring, and we didn't want to disturb the audience, so we kept our traps shut. I regret that choice.

How the hell can all of these disaster movies be so bad; I mean there's Godzilla, San Andreas and this train wreck. The story is so bad, though it is an interesting idea; but we had the villain who was behind the whole scheme have no depth put into him so we, the audience can understand his motivations, and maybe even sympathize with him. But, no, we just have this character lazily thrown into the story at the last minute to create a form of a movie. His motivations hardly make

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

sense, as well; I mean, he decides to blow everything up, including himself, so he can be President!??? Good plan, I hear you muttering, but it gets even better when the character (I'd rather not say) actually tells the "bland as tofu" heroes how to stop the 'geostorm' from happening!!! How the hell can I NOT complain about the writing, when it is THIS bad!?!

My friend, who sat next to me, and I pretty much predicted what's going to happen as the story continued; "Oh, he's gonna get killed"; "Oh, that guy's gonna escape". It even got so bad that when the villain was INTRODUCED, we guessed that he was the guy behind the 'geostorm' crap. And the clichés! So many clichés! They even used "the guy saves the day when the countdown reaches '1' cliché". Who uses that any more? Even "Alien" tricked the audience into believing they were doing that, and how did they trick the audience? Because that story can't be predicted like this one!!

The acting of some people are horrendous; and there's one actress I have to mention because I haven't seen anything LIKE it. Telitha Eliana Bateman, is only like 11, right, so I can't bully her too much, but Jesus, who the hell cast her into this film AND make her narrate it? I seriously hope they got sacked, along with Telitha.

However, there is one tiny part I liked about the film, which doesn't even matter to be honest, and that is the CG, because it looks pretty nice. But as another reviewer, also on this movie, said: "They spent 50 million on the special effects budget, but only 10 dollars on the screenplay budget."

In Conclusion, this film is a boring mess that tries to be more than it bargains for and so just makes it ANOTHER Disastrous Disaster Movie

6/10

10

Even before watching it, you already pretty much know what you're getting from this movie: scenes of big destruction & peril, cities crumbling, buildings toppling, and people running for their lives, etc. If that sounds fun, you will enjoy this movie. If you like other disaster movies like 2012, San Andreas, Day After Tomorrow, etc., you'll probably like this one. If you wanna be a snob and complain about writing or dialogue or whatever... well, what did you ever expect from a movie like this anyway? Just sit back and enjoy the disasters and explosions and have fun and you'll have a good time.

It's a movie that does what it sets out to do, so it gets a 10/10 from me.

Interestingly though, there's also a space station disaster subplot that's a bigger proportion of the movie than you might expect. Gerard Butler actually spends the bulk majority of the movie in a malfunctioning/exploding sci-fi space station, which is nothing to

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

complain about, because the space disaster scenes actually look super impressive. In fact, I think the space scenes were actually worth my IMAX 3D ticket more than the weather scenes.

Other things of note: I thought it was pretty funny that at one point Gerard Butler's American character randomly points out that he was actually born in the UK. It's like someone behind the camera realized that his American accent sounds kinda wobbly and wrote in that line as a clever way of excusing it.

10

Going into the cinema with a friend we were both really looking forward to this movie, as soon as it ended I made sure I rated it 10 out of 10, he looked at me and thought I was crazy. I looked at him and told him that it was better than 2012, movies like this according to him need to have more action in them, I disagreed. I believe this movie had all the elements necessary for a great movie, the highlight for me was the screenplay, the dialogue and the acting which were all tremendous. Every character played his/her part well and with real emotion. I was not in any way disappointed, I went to see a movie that I had a great expectations about and I walked out of the cinema feeling very satisfied. All these negative reviews am I seeing for this movie don't make sense, I think that we need to focus more on the individual elements that make up movies, not just looking at the movie as a whole. I would not have made any changes to the script or any of the parts, it was visually engaging for the majority of the time and I would recommend it to anyone who not only likes a bit of action but some light hearted moments as well. Definitely would see this again, no doubt about it.

10

Tesla Tesla Tesla

This movie has Elon Musk written all over it.

It's about a space engineer trying to fix a weather-controlling satellite before a massive disaster, the Geostorm, with a pretty big budget, and a great cast, including the well-known guys like Gerald Butler, Ed Harris and Andy Garcia, it succeed to deliver. Ultimately, Geostorm is a solid enough movie, with good directing, great music, good acting, and possibly one of the craziest disaster movies out there.

Gerald Butler is great as the troubled Jake. The crew of the ISS is also great, particularly Alexandra Maria Lara as Commander Ute, Eugenio Derbez as Hernandez, and Amr Waked (who I at first thought it's Antonio Banderas) as Dussette. Ed Harris is amazing as Leonard Dekkom, and Andy Garcia is also very good as President Palma. Jim Sturgess as Max, however is wooden at times, so does Abbie Cornish as Secret Service agent Sarah Wilson, although she did got some bad ass moments which is great.

The movie pushed the boundaries of believability, and presents us with probably one of the most craziest, over-the-top doomsday scenario ever

put on film. Frozen on the Afghanistan desert, extreme heat on Hong Kong, and massive tsunami in Dubai is just one of the examples of how over-the-top, but still enjoyable film. It's a solid mark on Devlin's directorial work, and we can expect to see him directing again soon. The story's focus about climate change actually helps in adding tension and kept us imagining what happened if these disasters happened in real life. The humor is also well executed, and worked, especially those who seems to come straight outta a meme(Marry Her! - the president). The editing is also, very well done. Intense scenes felt very intense. Action scenes felt very exciting, and emotional scenes felt very impactful. They also tried at concealing the plot twist in the movie, and they did very well. The cinematography is good, and the music is also, very good, another remarkable work by Lorne Balfe. What does surprise me is it's political subplot, which actually, a great idea (but leads to one of my gripes with this movie).
Geostorm is insanity at it's finest. The over-the-top plot, along with great cast, good performance and an all-out spectacle of destruction makes it a enjoyable ride from start to finish.

7

I saw a pre-screening of Happy Death Day and let me tell you, it was one of the most fun theater experiences I've had. The movie doesn't take itself too seriously, which is definitely for the best. If anyone walks into a movie about a sorority girl living the same day over and over and being killed over and over and expects it to be some genre-defying horror perfection, that's on them.
However, that doesn't mean this is a bad movie by any means. Jessica Rothe as Tree Gelbman and Israel Broussard as Carter Davis are fantastic as the two leads. They have excellent chemistry and make us root for them. Rothe's character wasn't the typical horror movie sorority girl, either. She was cunning and badass. She made us believe she could actually figure this mess out. If you don't change your mind on who the killer is at least twice throughout the film, you aren't paying attention.
There are curveballs thrown left and right, which made my theater gasp and yell numerous times. You think the movie is about to end on at least two different occasions. The script is smart, there's horror, there's comedy, there's drama. Happy Death Day takes you in numerous directions, while also making sure you have fun along the way. This is definitely one of my all-time favorite campy horror flicks out there. It even pokes fun at Groundhog Day, which it very clearly took some inspiration from. I recommend this to anyone who enjoys horror; again, it doesn't redefine the genre and there are definitely an abundance of clichés. With that, though, there are still a handful of clever moments I certainly was not expecting.

8

When I saw the trailer for this movie I admit I rolled my eyes and groaned that they were trotting out the circular time gimmick again. It was of course classic in Groundhog Day, but never seemed to click since then. I was dubious, but after seeing it with my own eyes, I can say I had a great time. I'm not sure if Blum House intended it to be funny, but it had a lot of humor in it, enough I would say to qualify it as a dark comedy. The cast was superb and while it didn't offer anything groundbreaking in terms of murders/deaths, I didn't mind because the story was so well connected and it really had me guessing right up until the end. Another litmus test for the quality of this movie is that the audience was rather quiet during the presentation. I've been to enough of these films to know that when you get a young audience seated in the dark and the film is a snooze, they'll start to talk and whisper and just annoy the Hell out of you. This movie managed to hold the attention of the entire audience and in this day and age I must say, that is an achievement in and of itself. I wasn't prepared to enjoy Happy Death Day as much as I did, but even I can admit when I was wrong. It worked from start to finish. I wasn't aware that Scott Lobdell wrote the script, but when I saw his name in the credits, I realized another reason I enjoyed it. I am familiar with his writing in the comic book industry and he is one of the more notable scribes. It's good to see the skills transfer.

8

I think people going to see this movie are expecting wayyyy too much from a slasher movie. I'm rating it based on what I expected, and I was certainly impressed. This movie wasn't trying to be anything more than another murder movie, but what made me want to see it was the idea of taking Groundhog Day (which it fully admitted to ripping the idea from) and turning it into a slasher film. I was actually surprised it held back on gore and blood. I was fully expecting it to be all the tropes of gross-out killings, but it was instead focused more on character development and the story. I admit the characters are a bit one-dimensional, but again, it's a slasher movie. It's trying to win any academy awards here. In many ways I think it's parodying those one-dimensional characters of college trope characters and the "last girl" in horror movies because it goes all-in on establishing the main characters as somebody you're meant to hate at first. The ending genuinely took me in a direction I didn't anticipate, and then it took me back to what I was expecting, but did it in a way that I felt fresh. All in all, I had fun watching this movie, which I think what this movie was meant to be: Fun.

10

I went into Happy Death Day with low expectations, thinking it would be

a fun yet cheesy horror movie. I was right about one thing: it's very, very fun. Now, don't let the frightening trailer fool you: this is a not a very scary movie. Yes, there are some tense moments, usually followed by a jump scare, and there was moderate PG-13 violence, but this movie succeeds more in its one-liners than its death sequences. There are tons of good jokes from Jessica Rothe, who is the best part of this movie by far. And there is a twist, it's not very memorable, but it's smart and well thought out, and it leads to a very satisfying end fight scene. Despite the misleading marketing, Happy Death Day is an hilarious and entertaining horror/comedy.

9

This type of movie has been done many times before and rarely succeeds, but this one was a hit for me!

Jessica Rothe's performance is what kept me interested... she nailed her character and was convincing and funny as well.

I don't want to give too much away, but the twists towards the end were a nice surprise and earned a few extra points from me.

It's classified as a Horror, Mystery, Thriller but it's also a comedy as I found myself laughing a bunch of times.

Certainly a must-see entertaining film produced and executed very well, much better than many other films in this genre.

It's a well deserved 9/10 from me.

10

I'm starting to see a trend develop in modern horror movies (the good ones at least) and I really like it. Film makers are beginning to realise that for horror to work there has to be some different levels to the film. 90 minutes of watching people get killed isn't going to be able to cut it anymore. You have to be able to make the audience laugh, think and even move them emotionally. If you can do that then your film will be a success. Earlier this year 'Get Out' pulled it off and now 'Happy Death Day' has nailed it too.

When the opening logos featured a joke (literally in the first few seconds of the film) I thought I may have misread the tone of the film in the trailers. Turns out I had, but in a good way. It wasn't an indication that the film was to be a laugh-fest, simply that it had that layer to it. And the thing about the layers that the film possesses it that every one of them works. Whatever it tries to pull off it manages.

The twists and turns and how crafty it is about concealing them truly blew me away. At least three times I thought to myself such and such element would be better if they'd done so and so, only to later find out they did indeed have that up their sleeve the whole time. The film is incredibly smart.

I can't say enough good things about this film. The trailers won't give

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

a fair indication to people of what this film is truly capable of, and so sadly I fear many who would love it will not get around to seeing it. If you get the chance though please do see it. It's a fantastic film and you won't be disappointed.

7

The trailer for this film accompanied by 50 Cent's "In Da Club" looked incredibly dumb, but that didn't mean that the film wasn't going to be a stupid good time. These types of repetition of a certain day films are somewhat popular with recent incarnations being completely forgettable. Groundhog Day gets it right, and I was curious to see a college slasher drama try to take a different spin on the idea.

The film is about Tree Gelbman, a typical short fused sorority girl who loves to party and get drunk and her trials against a day that keeps repeating. On her birthday she is murdered and the day keeps resetting until she can figure out who her killer is. The daily death takes a toll on her body and she gets physically weaker each time. its a tough task having to try to figure things out when everything around her resets and the killer and his/her motivations remain unknown.

Jessica Rothe was just perfect for this role. She's an attractive lead who played the college girl role to a tee. Her character grows by the end of the film and you start to feel a better connection with her as she becomes a different human being when her constant death teaches her about her own life. Other than that, there aren't really many fleshed out or identifiable characters, which is fine. This is a cheap thriller

and should be treated a such, doesn't mean it isn't entertaining.

The repetition surprisingly doesn't overstay its welcome and keeps itself fun. This film is barely a horror because its so stupid and the film knows it. Its more of a comedy with killing than anything else. Which is perfectly fine. The killer reveal is kind of obvious despite the writers trying to twist you away from it. Overall, you won't have much of an impression from this picture but it makes for a good time in the cinema.

6.5/10

7

Jessica Rothe is amusingly pithy and savvy playing a selfish college beauty, a spoiled sorority sister who rules the school until she is stabbed and killed on her way to a surprise birthday party by a masked lunatic. But fate plays this campus cutie an unusual hand once she discovers she's living her birthday over and over again, each time attempting to cheat death but always running into her attacker. Screenwriter Scott Lobdell isn't trying to sneak a slasher variant of 'Groundhog Day' passed us--he's upfront about the similarities, even exalts in them, while toying with all the possibilities such a scenario can offer. It takes Rothe three tries to fully comprehend what's happening to her; once she formulates a plan (creating a suspect list), Lobdell mixes things up, so that the movie rarely feels repetitive. Our heroine, snarky to start, follows Bill Murray's example and becomes a better person on her twisted journey (reestablishing contact with her father, apologizing to her roommate, even causing her own demise on one occasion to prevent the cute nerd from the boys' dorm from losing his life). Director Christopher B. Landon deserves credit for delivering a modern-day thriller with lots of action but no gore and no nudity. If it isn't quite a family-friendly slasher flick, it certainly is a squirrely, sassy one, with some big laughs counterbalancing the suspense. Good show! *** from ****

10

The terror in Happy Death Day is the movie's comedy, as the point is to represent the compromise of eternity being allowed to experience censorship as a means to its existence.

Eternity is an impossible venture without origin. Origin is therefore something which isn't infinite, and for the sake of juxtaposition is destructive. The origin which is meant to hurt is the paradox of being meant to help eternity come to fruition.

Further juxtaposition, is that eternity itself becomes a force which isn't based around being for the sake of anything. Eternity is the end product of visual symmetry, but for the connection between eternity and visual symmetry to operate, the nature of the visual symmetry has to comprise nervousness. The internal state of conflict that defines the visual symmetry is the logic of the visual symmetry being its own self-supporter, even though eternity was never completely independent.

In Happy Death Day, visual symmetry is the end product, and the compromise of its status as an end product is that its composition is pointlessness and nervousness. In contrast, visual hierarchy sets the movie off, and the usual composition of visual hierarchy is assumption and objective. Theresa's story goes from visual hierarchy to visual symmetry, and the hierarchy elements are based around meeting objectives, while the equality elements are based around past events.

So in essence, Happy Death Day is the style of hierarchy being about future objectives, and equality being about the past as he contrast is the representation of the symbiotic relationship between eternity and its point of origin.

Of course, all of this makes Happy Death Day into a film which is excellent, inspiring and moving. Jessica Rothe is fantastic as Theresa Gelbman, and it's precisely her story that represents the complexity of loneliness being a virtuous concept. Happy Death Day is a much more intellectual movie than most other horror films - and most other comedies period.

By a long stretch, one of the best movies of 2017

8

With Halloween coming up, I started taking a look at what Horror movies were being shown on the big screen. Finding Vincenzo Natali's Haunter (which has the same hook, but a darker tone) to be superb, I was excited to spot a film on the big screen with a similar set-up, which led to me joining in the Death Day.

The plot:

Waking up with a killer hangover on her birthday, Theresa & Tree; Gelbman pushes fellow student Carter Davis to the side, and spends the entire day being grumpy to everyone, from binning a birthday cupcake her roommate Lori makes, to ignoring her dad's invitation to meet up (Tree's late mum had the same birthday.) Going to a party later that night, Tree is stopped in her tracks by a masked stranger, who gets out a knife and kills her. Expecting to be dead, Tree instead finds herself re-living her birthday (where the same person kills her.) Caught in a

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

time-loop, Tree starts trying to find out who the masked killer is, in order to stop her unhappy death day.

View on the film:

Setting the timer, the screenplay by X-Men Comic-Book writer Scott Lobdell spends the opening 15 minutes cheekily ribbing the clichés of the Slasher genre, via Davis being the well-meaning pretty boy, Tree being the popular, mean "it girl";, and Tree's entire clique being based

around showing the nerds who really is too cool for school. Catching Tree in a time loop, Lobdell gives the shiny Slash shocks sharp, underlying psychological terror, as each time she is murdered, leads to Tree getting increasingly raw fears that she will never escape the loop. Along with slicing up over a dozen, weapons- grade "Final Girl" battles, Lobdell takes an excellent stab at Horror-Comedy, that shines in each attempt Tree makes to survive the day, from Tree walking round the campus care-free and naked, to the headache Tree gets of having to re-live a deadly morning routine.

Perfectly stepping in time with Lobdell, director Christopher Landon & cinematographer Toby Oliver turn the Slasher Knife with an irresistible Pop-Rock atmosphere, of whip-pans around the campus, and neon lights over the killings that creates a party mood. Backed by a jumpy score from Bear McCreary and a great mask designed by "Ghostface" creator Tony Gardner, Landon gets into the Slasher groove with ultra-stylised tracking shots following Tree and the psycho, and overlapping slo-mo eyeing the wear and tear Tree experiences in the loop. The only one aware of what is happening, Jessica Rothe gives an excellent performance as Tree, whose sarcastic dry-wit Rothe hits with a real relish, that transforms into a tough, thoughtful confidence, as Tree wishes her killer a happy death day.

7

I had low expectations and I have to say they were totally exceeded .

This is an enjoyable Romantic Horror with more than a passing reference to GROUNDHOG DAY - and the occasional reminiscing of the 15 year old Shaun of the dead . Plus a bit of Scream , scary movie and a number of other slasher movies .

Jessica Roshe was brilliant in the starring role , you believe in her character , her charm was endearing and despite the 10 years between her character and actual age she played the combination of innocent romantic with a touch a modern feisty independent female in control of her own destiny .

The only poor point was how the inevitable twist was handled - that could have been slightly better but definitely worth seeing .

Pad.A 7/10

7

I was pretty excited to see this movie. I loved "Before I Fall" and I also love Horror/Thriller films....so seeing that "Happy Death Day" was

a combination of both of those things, I decided that I should go see it.

I honestly thought this film was pretty decent....even though it wasn't quite as good as I wanted it to be.

The biggest problem was that this movie didn't scare me at all. I might have felt a little spooked just once...but that hardly the "OMG I so scared god!! Argh!!" type reaction that the movie wanted me to have. None of the scary/suspenseful scenes really got me. I feel like this happened because this movie tried to be two things at once. It tried to be a drama like "Before I Fall"; while also trying to be scary like "Scream"; yet only ends up being OK in both ends of the spectrum. It feels like "a jack of all trades master of none" situation.

The other problem was the exposition involving our heroine was poorly handled. Not spoil things...basically our protagonist actually has a backstory....but it is given so little substance and emotional weight that it was just meh. It also isn't as integrated into the story as well as it could have been. I feel that her backstory could have been more developed and/or given more emotional impact.

Despite these problems, I still enjoyed the film.

I liked the plot. Even though I never felt scared, the movie gave me more than enough interest for me to be invested in the story for the entire run time. It will most certainly keep you engaged. And I think the pay off to that story was pretty good, even if it felt a bit rushed in hindsight.

I also enjoyed the performances. Obviously none of them are going to be Oscar-winning material, but I think they did the job well enough that I felt immersed in what was going on. So good job guys!!

Another thing that I liked was that I didn't find myself cringing constantly like I do with other horror media like the "Scream TV show". Never once did I find myself rolling my eyes whenever someone open their mouth. Is the dialogue particularly memorable? Not really. But the fact that it wasn't a total cringe fest was certainly great news for me.

Lastly, I thought the pacing was pretty decent. I did find it slow at times, but the story had enough going on that I never once felt bored or irritated or anything like that.

Overall, I found this movie to be reasonably enjoyable. Despite its flaws, I found the story and the performances enjoyable enough that I can say that I had a good enough time. I give this film 3.5/5 stars.

8

This film is really one of a kind. It does a terrific job of evoking fear, as well as making you laugh out loud. The film itself is satirical in nature. It truly is a film everyone should go see, and is enjoyable for all ages. The film builds up well, and continues to succeed up until the end. The ending is very outrageous in nature, and seems to be a forced plot twist filled with ridiculous exposition. The ending will either leave you amused, or just disappointed. This film is worth it though!

6

Happy Death Day comes from Blumhouse Productions, the studio made famous for the resurgence of horror in theaters (Get Out, The Purge, Insidious). However, this is the lightest of light thrills. Sure, it would fit in the slasher movie bin, but with its bubble gum aesthetics and goofy comedy, it's really more Freaky Friday than Friday the 13th. And in that sense, it's mildly charmingU if not bright enough to be great. For starters, the premise is pretty stupid, and the execution of that premise isn't much better. A brash and awful sorority girl is forced to relive the same birthday over and over, each one ending in her own murder by a masked killer. Imagine Groundhog Day or Edge of Tomorrow, but in the teen-screams genre and with a lot less complexity. In fact, most of its "originality" just comes in its blanket theft from other properties and throwing them all together: the youth world of Mean Girls; the comedy of "Scream Queens"; the protagonist from "The Good Place"; the scares from The Purge. It's not bad, just familiar, like we're reliving this recognizable movie just as the character relives her day. Once our girl starts trying to solve the whodunit-mystery, things get more assured and fun, as we find it easier to root for her and her insistence on not dying each day ad infinitum. Even though the deaths and scares are wanting, the other elements work, especially the humor and (gasp!) the heart. It's harmless and forgettable October fare, made more for people who hate horror than me. In other words, my wife will love it.

1

Happy Death Day is one of the worst horror films of 2017. The cast is highly irritating, and just forgettable. Tree Gelbman yes you read that right, the main character is named Tree, played by Jessica Rothe. Her character is nothing that I even care for, just an ignorant girl from a rich family acting like she is better than anyone around her, her sorority sisters are just as pathetic. So here we sit watching some over privileged character walk through the steps of a "Groundhog Day" style film, living her death over and over again, which was portrayed in the trailer.

Scott Lobdell was the writer for this terrible film, and in my opinion highly plagiarized from Groundhog Day, except this hack of a writer will not be sued because the story was tweaked enough and he turned it into a horror slasher style film, instead of a comedy.

If people want to pay money to see such drivel then by all means, go right ahead. There is no likable character, I wanted them all to die, and there is no point to see this film unless it's something to fall asleep to. That's it folks move along now nothing to see here. 6.7 is a fake rating made by this fake website and fake people. This is a big old zero people. Avoid at all costs.

5

Comedy, horror drama. The heroine played by Jessica Rothe is murdered at the end of her birthday! The murderer is disguised by a 'baby face' mask, and she immediately wakes up at the beginning of the same day, over and over and over again. She now knows what will happen during the course of the repeating day and we then see her murdered again, each time in a different manner.

Every time she wakes we see that she has suffered some injury relevant to the murder, and these accumulate over the passing days. Her urgent need is to slowly piece together the evidence in the course of each repeating day until she can determine who the killer is. Every morning her frustration grows but at least she slowly progresses towards knowing who the killer is. Every morning we see her realise that reliving the same day gives her the opportunity to slowly learn how to be a better person.

Comparison with 'Ground Hog Day' and 'Edge of Tomorrow' are inevitable – GHD is even referenced at the end during a brief conversation.

Jessica Rothe's performance is the only thing stopping this feeling like a very low budget made for T.V. movie.

8

If you get a strong sense of déjà vu watching Happy Death Day, that's because it takes the basic premise of Bill Murray classic Groundhog Day and adds a whole heap of familiar slasher clichés. But whilst undeniably derivative, the film still manages to be huge fun. At first one wonders whether it will succeed in offering anything beyond its high-concept mash-up premise, but as things progress it becomes clear that we're in safe hands, writer Scott Lobdell delivering a clever and witty script with director Christopher Landon confidently handling the action so that repetition never seems boring.

Replacing Murray's obnoxious weatherman is attractive but self-obsessed sorority bitch Tree (Jessica Rothe) whose birthday brings an unexpected surprise; death! a psycho in a mask attacking her as she makes her way to a party. To Tree's horror, she is forced to relive the day again and again until she can work out the identity of her murderer and prevent herself from being killed. As in Groundhog Day, Tree is able to change the course of her repeated day with the knowledge she has gleaned, and ultimately becomes a much nicer person in the process. In the Andie MacDowell role is Israel Broussard as nice guy Carter Davis, who tries to help Tree with her terrible predicament.

Equal parts wry comedy and PG friendly horror, Happy Death Day isn't about to scare your socks off, but thanks to fine performances from a solid cast, some imaginative plot twists, and a snappy pace, it's still hugely entertaining stuff that should appeal to horror and non-horror fans alike.

7

I was pleasantly surprised by this film! I went in expecting it to be a repetitive storyline incorporating a mad man in a stereotypical doll mask. I can truthfully say it definitely surprised me! As seen in the previews, Tree is reliving her birthday over and over, trying to figure out the man behind the mask. While the movie is a thriller, it was really the surprising pop ups that get you. I really recommend this movie to anyone finding themselves wanting a fun movie that isn't only going to make you spill your popcorn, but also leave the theatre thinking about everything you just watched unfold on screen.

6

Saw 'Happy Death Day'; as somebody who was fascinated by the concept, found the advertising interesting and good enough to warrant a view and who appreciates horror when done well. Seeing it just before Halloween as part of my Halloween celebrations, will admit to not being as bowled over by the film as would have liked but enjoying it a good deal. As surprisingly interesting as the advertising was (and there has been some dreadful advertising this year, a notable recent example being the completely mis-marketed 'Geostorm'), it is also misleading. One would expect a truly frightening film judging from the trailers, but actually 'Happy Death Day' happened to be much more than what was indicated and wasn't what one would call terrifying or sleep-with-the-light-on-for-a-week. The good news is that 'Happy Death Day' actually makes the most of its concept, refreshing having seen films recently that had concepts that they didn't do anywhere near enough with. The not so good news is that as enjoyable as it was it did feel like something was missing. It is easy to see why lots of people will like, and have liked 'Happy Death Day'. It is just as easy to see why it will be, and has been, a let-down for others. My opinion has shades of both, leaning towards the former. 'Happy Death Day' may be somewhat standard (while the concept is a pretty unique one, some of the story elements aren't), superficial (other than the lead character, the characters are developed very flimsily) and some parts don't make as much sense as they could and feel unfinished. Was expecting more from the killer twist reveal, which is not as clever and surprising as one would like and the whole ending felt rather silly and rushed to me (the killer's motive also came over as really trivial for an elaborate set-up). A little slow to begin with too, it's once the concept kicks in when 'Happy Death Day' properly comes to life and maintains that energy for the rest of the film. For all those faults though, 'Happy Death Day' is also refreshingly self-aware, almost very much aware of its standard-ness and superficiality and acknowledges it, and manages to be lots of fun,

creepy-suspenseful and surprisingly thought-provoking. Gruesomely funny sums it up very well.

Happy Death Day is a long way from amateurish visually, the photography is stylish rather than slapdash, the editing has suitably unnerving moments and the lighting is atmospheric. Christopher Landon never lets it get too heavy while not diluting the fun or scares, and the at times haunting and at others times funky soundtrack adds a lot.

When it comes to the script, Happy Death Day is full of knowing humour and never removes its tongue from its cheek, instead keeping it firmly intact throughout which proved to come off really well. It also really makes one think. The story execution is not perfect, but it's never dull and has some neat twists and turns that stops it from being predictable and repetitive.

Jessica Rothe should become a bigger star after her excellent lead turn here, she has been acting a few years before this but this is the first time where she really held my attention and allowed me to take proper notice of her. Israel Broussard is also very believable and the two have great chemistry together. The acting on the whole is solid but essentially it's all about Rothe and she is one of the main reasons why Happy Death Day is worth a viewing.

Overall, a long way from perfect but quite enjoyable. 6/10 Bethany Cox

7

I had a blast with this film and i absolutely loved it

Yes I know this concept has been done before; Groundhog Day, Source Code, Edge of Tomorrow and etc

BUT this film adds a new spin on the same day repeats until the mystery is solved concept by taking it and merging it with a slasher film premise

Now this kind of film could easily go downhill if wrongly executed but Happy Death Day does a decent job of handling this concept

It has fun with it and pokes fun at it

The film is also a bit self aware of the clichés and tropes of the slasher genre so it's understandable when something a bit dumb happens

It wastes no time and you can easily breeze through the entire film without feeling any fatigue because every twist and turn in the film keeps it fresh and entertaining and keeps you on the edge of your seat, it's also of the right run time, just 1 hour 35 something minutes which felt right for this film

It's very well shot too surprisingly, I don't think I've seen any of Chris Landon(the director of this film)'s work before but he impressed me with this film

There is a lot of humor which adds to the film because the film doesn't take itself too seriously and doesn't take a very dark route even though it is still a horror film

It also has some cool scares and suspenseful moments, not too scary but that's fine by me because of the rest of the film kept me engaged

I have

to mention the lead actress because my review would not be complete without mentioning her, Jessica Roth did a fantastic job as the lead girl in this film, her performance was so charismatic and its apparent that she enjoyed this role a lot because she delivered a better performance than i expected, A break out star performance and i hope to see her in more films now

And not just the performance, her character development in the film was simple but handled well, and combined with her performance, it made her character and her performance very likable

The mystery of the film is engaging although once it is revealed, you might criticize some parts of it but overall the film worked so little problems can be overlooked

The soundtrack is cool too, i looked for some of the songs after the film ended and i got hooked

It may not be a classic or a genre defining film but if you just want to forget your problems and have a fun time with maybe an easy to watch film, pick this up, Would be even better if you watch it in a group with maybe your friends, it'll be a good experience because Happy Death Day is very enjoyable

6

The trailer for "Happy Death Day" doesn't do the actual movie justice, something we see the other way around more often. I have to admit that partially because of this I was skeptical about it, only to be pleasantly surprised by the time the credits rolled. Don't get me wrong, in no way is this film supposed to be taken too seriously, yet I am glad that one is not forced to completely lower their standards to enjoy it.

Jessica Rothe's performance is great, even in the beginning of the movie where she is pretty much a total douche bag to everyone she somehow manages to come off quite charming and charismatic. And that's the thing about Happy Death Day; it's not necessarily a cinematic masterpiece, yet it has some kind of easy breezy charm to it which makes you curious.

The writers make the audience play a guessing game, more specifically "who killed me?" by (quite cleverly) introducing all suspects on the first day. Then it's up to the audience to decide who is most likely, or better yet unlikely the killer. The answer was neither shocking nor predictable, that's the only thing that left me unimpressed. Instead of having that "omg no way" moment you will probably be more like "huh? wait? it was them?". The reveal of the killer to be confusing is a flaw that cannot be overlooked, because it is what the entire movie has led up to.

But other than that Happy Death Day was an entertaining watch, I would especially love to see more from Jessica Rothe. In a way the story line feels like a homage to the oh-so lovable classics it has drawn inspiration from. I guess that's reason enough to go and check it out.

Be sure not to go into it too critically tough, it's hard to take a movie serious when the ones poking most fun at it (in an innocent way) are the creators themselves.

7

Although the core narrative is not original by any stretch, there are good reasons for liking this lightweight foray into the slasher genre. There are some original elements incorporated into the hoary old Groundhog Day chestnut – just enough dusting and polishing to make you forgive the pillaging. It doesn't aim for the same conceptual depth of, say, Timecrimes (2007), Triangle (2009), The Butterfly Effect (2004) or Edge of Tomorrow (2014) but it does manage to incorporate a nifty murder mystery thread into the time-loop motif and the execution feels a deal fresher than it probably should.

Bratty, morally challenged and egocentric frat girl Tree (Jessica

Rothe) finds herself living her birthday over and over again, each day ending with her murder at the hands of a masked stalker. All she has to do is find out the identity of her killer and avoid being killed in order to break the cycle. The film is not hard core or extreme in any sense that might apply to the bulk of modern slasher flicks. There are no real scares, there is no excess of blood and guts, no explicit violence, no torture porn or gratuitous sexual activity or nudity. So what does it have going for it?

It's engaging, mildly funny in places and generally quite likable.

Jessica Rothe is winningly cute in the lead. And not in a painfully forced or superficial way. Her gradual transition from selfish and self-absorbed sorority bitch to a more enlightened and humane persona is skilfully handled. You start out thinking she pretty much deserves her fate and then end up rooting for her to succeed. Rothe plays it just right and you can't help liking her. She is one of the most rounded and sympathetic female leads in a slasher movie since Jamie Lee Curtis in Carpenter's original Halloween (1978). In fairness, most of the cast deliver in terms of injecting some level of believability and personality into their rather clichéd stock characters.

HDD deserves credit for some stylish camera-work and editing – both of which are tight, smart and in some places strikingly unusual. The key emphasis is on taking a well-worn concept, playing around with it and having fun. And that's what you've got here, a fun genre piece that doesn't take itself seriously and entertains for the running time. Unlike Scream it doesn't lose itself in self-reverential satire and admiration for it's own cleverness in ragging on genre tropes, and is all the better for it.

It doesn't do anything ground-breaking or jolting, won't set the world on fire, and anyone expecting a visceral thrill-ride is more than likely to feel short-changed. But, I found it enjoyable enough, even though I'm far removed – very far removed – from its target audience. And I must add that I was wrong-footed by the ending, fully expecting

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

the stock horror movie twist which isn't really a twist anymore – the one where you think everything's OK but suddenly evil triumphs. The twist this time around was a bit different to what I'd resigned myself to. And Groundhog Day does get a belated name check.

So all in all, not bad, just about happy enough.

8

Happy death day is one of those films that turns out to be miles better than what the trailer offers you to go watch it.

Plot is interesting Tree (Jessica rothe) wakes up and relives the same day by getting killed over and over again and has to figure out who is the killer to stop this endless cycle.

Groundhog Day meets Scream, now it may sound a bit crazy but Christopher Landon (director) pulls of a great film in the way it's been shot and put together.

With some great acting, light hearted humour and a mystery that will keep you guessing right till the end Happy Death Day is a great horror/thriller and definitely one to watch this Halloween.

5

Some friends invited me for a horror mystery thriller movie, so all fine by me.

But then, the film started.... This was no horror film. Most of the movie felt like American Pie having the naked scenes replaced with some serial killer slaying again and again the same person without any obvious reason(or any reason whatsoever as I realized in the end).

Anyway, the actors were not memorable. Their acting skills were okay. I guess they would seem as something more to a teenager and this is why I am amazed by the number of good reviews this film got. The plot moves along in a totally predictable manner. We see repeatedly the same day of a rich sorority girl waking up in the room of some guy who was kind enough to pick up her pieces after she got wasted the night before. Then she goes on her day and gets killed in slightly different manner every night. Then wakes up at the guys dorm again and everything starts happening again until she finally realizes that she is trapped in a triangle-like situation. The theme is one we know all too well,so nothing much to expect there(so much for the thriller and mystery). The protagonist tries to explore some ways of solving the "mystery" but drops them all really fast so we see pretty much more of the same with tiny variations,while she tries to act all scared and panicked. Each morning finds her more screamier than the one before and the in-the-mean-time- reactions make things a bit funny or cringy. Certainly not scary or thrilling.

The main problem with this movie is that it tries to pass itself as some horror,mystery film while it's a comedy- crime/light mystery, if it has to be called something. It's a total joke of a horror movie. And

it would be amusing if it was advertised as such. You cringe,you laugh but you certainly don't feel any threat at any point. And that's understandable since you have little time to learn anything about any of the characters. What do we know? She dates and sleeps around,not surprising for a sorority girl. She gets scared when they try to kill her, but that's a normal reaction for any human being. After reliving the same thing over and over she decides to stop repeating her actions and explore other possibilities, so nothing really interesting here either.

In the end we had a movie with much more laughter than the amount justified for a horror film,no plot,not a deep mystery,in contrast to what we expected and no interesting characters. But we still managed to have some fun with this thrash dialogue film. Not really worth seeing.

9

I thought this was just a cheap slasher movie version of groundhog day.

Oddly enough it was. Girl wakes up in a dorm room goes about her day then gets murdered before the day ends just to repeat the day again and again with her murder hiding they're identity behind a mask.

Here is the surprise though. This movie is actually good! The girl is the stereotypical bitchy (or witchy if they've censored the movie like they did over here) cheerleader. Pretty much every single person in her life has a reason to want her dead. This works as you go through the list of suspects (sometimes hilariously) and don't feel bad seeing her die over and over.

It more then earns the big reveal in the end and I found it to be a fun light hearted popcorn movie for Halloween.

This movie got one extra point for being bold enough to actually straight up say "hey, you know what your story reminds me off? Groundhog day, that movie with Bill Murray." right at the end before the closing credits.

6

It was a fantastic coincidence this film came out close to when I was celebrating my 30th birthday, the trailer for this scary movie looked great, a cross between Groundhog Day and Scream, "Groundhog Slay" if you like, from Blumhouse Productions (Insidious, Whiplash, Get Out), so I was really looking forward to it. Basically Teresa "Tree" Gelbman (La La Land's Jessica Rothe) wakes up on her birthday, Monday 18th September, in the dorm room of classmate Carter Davis (Israel Broussard) following a heavy night of drinking. Tree leaves and spends the day being self-centered, dismissive and condescending to her fellow classmates and previous hook-ups, ignores calls from her father, throws away a cupcake made by her roommate Lori Spengler (Ruby Modine, Matthew's daughter), and is having an affair with her professor Gregory Butler (Charles Aitken). That night, Tree is heading to her "surprise" birthday party, when she is lured into a tunnel, there she is murdered

by a hooded figure wearing a baby mask, the campus mascot. Tree wakes up in the morning, in the same dorm as before, and the previous day's events repeat, unnerved Tree relives the same day again, but avoids the tunnel. Instead she returns to the sorority house for her party, Tree enjoys herself and quickly hooks up with her classmate Nick Sims (Blaine Kern III), but the masked killer is there, he murders Nick, then kills her. Tree is terrified to find herself repeating events all over again, she is trapped in a time loop, she avoids her death this time by barricading herself in her room, but she is murdered again when the killer was hiding in the bathroom. During the next loop, Tree tells her story to Carter, he suggests she take advantage of the loop, make a list of all the suspects to figure out who is trying to kill her, she spends the next few loops following suspected students, all of which end up with her murdered as she stalks the wrong person each time. Tree also takes advantage of her situation and enjoys the reactions of everyone seeing her walk around the campus completely naked. On the next loop, Tree passes out following her previous death, being bludgeoned by a baseball bat, she is taken to hospital where she finds she has retained damaged from her other murders. Then she finds herself chased by the killer again through the hospital, until she escapes in Butler's car, while driving at high speed she is pulled over by a police officer, she volunteers to be arrested to avoid being killed, however the killer shows up and blows her up with leaking gas and a match. Waking up in Carter's bedroom again, Tree convinces him of the predicament knowing a number of events before they happen, going to a restaurant, she admits she doesn't like who she's become, including being distant from her father, since the death of her mother three years ago, they shared the same birthday. Tree sees the local news broadcast report, that serial killer Joseph Tombs (Rob Mello) is being held in the hospital, she concludes he is the masked killer. Tree races to the hospital to warn of Tombs' escape, the killer breaks free and nearly kills her, Carter follows and ends up killed by Tombs, Tree is chased into the bell tower, realising Carter will remain dead if she doesn't restart the loop, she hangs her from the tower. During the next loop, Tree spends her time righting the various wrongs she has caused, ending her affair with Dr. Butler, and meeting her father David (Jason Bayle) to resolve their situation. That night, Tree prepares to stop Tombs, he has the upper hand, but uses the knowledge of a blackout to disarm him and shoot him to death, she relieved to finally be free, and celebrates her birthday in her room, eating Lori's cupcake. However, the next morning, Tree is horrified to be waking up on her birthday again, killing Tombs did not stop the time loop, she is distraught and returns to her room to run away. Lori is there to offer her the cupcake again, Tree realises she died in her sleep, she never consumed the cupcake before, she realises Lori is the real killer, the cupcake is poisoned, and had access to Tombs with her job in the hospital. Lori confesses that she was jealous of Dr. Butler having an interest in Tree, the two fight, Tree manages to stuff the cupcake into Lori's

mouth, before kicking her out of the window, she falls to her death. Tree and Carter reflect on the day's events back at the restaurant, he offer her his room for the night, and comments that her situation is the movie Groundhog Day. Tree wakes up the next morning, she believes she is in another loop when the first few events repeat, but then Carter tells her it is Tuesday 19th September, he pranked her, she is mad for a moment, but then they relax and kiss. Also starring Rachel Matthews as Danielle Bouseman, Phi Vu as Ryan Phan, Laura Clifton as Stephanie Butler and Ramsey Anderson as Keith Lumbly. Rothe is well cast as the college student who has so many flaws that there are plenty of people who would want to kill her, the time loop format has been done before in various genres, thrillers like Source Code and sci-fi like Edge of Tomorrow, this is one of the first in the scary movie category. It is not really that scary, it has the odd small jump and creepy element, but it is very witty, satirical with the campus setting, and making obvious jokes about its own slasher movie format, it is just an enjoyable popcorn movie and crowd pleaser, perfect if celebrating your birthday as well, a fun horror. Good!

7

What was so fun with the horror movies in the 90s was how they made people unlikable before giving us the joy of murdering them. The actress was incredible at being unbearable, I was excited to see her be killed... repeatedly.

I was disappointed by the lack of gore, but then I appreciated it as a clever suspense. And it sure delivered. She powerfully expressed her psychological distress.

It was very fun, movies that laugh at themselves are the best comedies. It was actually deep and inspiring too about personal maturity and social interactions.

Seeing her relive the same day didn't feel repetitive, she doesn't just make different choices, her attitude becomes different too. I wasn't expecting much, but even when I do, I rarely get twists and endings this interesting. I'll gladly watch again!

I'm happy that more movies are using the Groundhog Day idea. Edge of Tomorrow was also interesting if you like science fiction.

6

Happy Death Day Review By Jordan Whitten

Plot: A college student must relive the day of her murder over and over again, in a loop that will end only when she discovers her killer's identity.

Although the concept and idea was a copy of Groundhog day, it turned out to be a thrilling, mysterious and intense film with loads of drama and action. However, does that make it a good movie? I guess we'll find out more in this review of Happy Death Day.

The first thing I will say about

this movie is that it is more funnier than scary. So if you're not a big fan of scary horror movies, there is literally nothing to be afraid of. You only encounter really 1 jump scare which is debatably scary, whether you are faint-hearted/timid person you would be quite frightened.

The movie Happy Death Day featured the main character Tree Gelbman (Jessica Rothe) and secondary main characters: Carter Davis (Israel Broussard), Lori Spengler (Ruby Modine), and Gregory Butler (Charles Aitken). Without a doubt the acting was great. Few errors were spotted throughout the whole motion picture. So no complaints there.

Other than that, the film felt like it was dragging on forever and it was never going to end. Considering it kept showing the same scenes over and over again which gradually got boring. Just when you think Tree might live to the next day, she doesn't, and that could really get you on your nerves and it frustrated me at one point in the movie. However, at the end of the movie when Tree finally discovered who her murderer is, I felt so relieved. After all the build up it all turned out to be quite useful in the end. It made the audience feel ecstatic. The film really keeps you guessing who the murderer is, I think it is an excellent movie in the mystery genre. I urged to discover who the killer was, I think it was it was killing me more than it was killing tree.

In conclusion, I personally think the movie is good, not great or amazing but just plain good. There were a couple faults I found in the movie, but there was also some really good things that happened in the film. It also shares some life lessons which is kinda neat. If you are going to see this motion picture, do not expect it to be a full on horror movie that will keep you on your feet. Although it does seem that away in the trailer, it's actually a really fun movie with Jessica Rothe saying a few funny jokes here and there. Happy Death Day is nothing that I expected it to be and I like that, hopefully you do too.

Personal Rating: 6.4/10 Is it worth watching: YES

6

'HAPPY DEATH DAY' - 2017

Directed by Christopher B Landon{Scouts Guide to the Zombie Apocalypse}

Starring Jessica Rothe{La La Land} and Israel Broussard{Flipped}

Plot Overview: ​When a young University student awakens in the dormitory of a complete stranger, she must move through her day until she inevitably gets killed off. The catch? She must relive this same fate ever day until she can stop the seemingly omnipotent and omnipresent killer.

Going into this film, I expected a low rent slasher with a silly premise that I could write of a garbage. Well it certainly wasn't that. I was pleasantly surprised with this movie. It's a very fun Halloween movie. Don't go into it expecting the next big thing in terms of horror, go in expecting a fun comedy with horror elements and I think that you'll enjoy this movie very much.

What can I say that I liked

about this movie, specifically? Well the tone was excellent. At the start, very few of the jokes hit for me so I got a little bit worried. But as the film progressed, it became a genuinely good comedy. I tend to like Horror-Comedies because I don't like the feeling of being scared, and thus a joke or two helps calm me down. The way they blend the two genres in this movie is almost effortless. It definitely leans a little more onto the comedy aspect than horror, which will definitely turn off those who EXPECTED this to be a horror movie. It's maybe a 1/4 horror movie, 3/4 comedy? The creepy and jumpy moments worked, but they were infrequent. With the exception of ONE, jump scares were also non existent in this movie. Thank the lord God for that! But to be fair, the one that they DO use was pretty effective and worked well. So as a whole, the tone for this movie was pretty darn excellent.

Another aspect of this movie that absolutely deserves praise, is

Jessica Rothe's performance as a Tree. Sorry, the character's name is Tree; the character is unfortunately not a tree. She is, actually, far from it. Most horror movies just substitute in a stereotype of a character and expect that to work but this movie doesn't. She's the pretty girl but she's also the deluded, sociopath. Seriously! At the start of this movie, the character Tree is about as likable as the plant one. But Rothe portrayed this character undeniably well. Even in the latter half of the movie, she portrays the character exceptionally well and really sells the character's growth.

Another actor who appears in this movie was Israel Broussard. Broussard also gives an excellent performance as Carter. Not only that, but I also REALLY buy the romance between Tree and Carter. It doesn't feel forced in the slightest and that is rare for a movie nowadays. It usually feels wrong when two characters get together in a movie because I just cannot see it happening in real life. But thankfully, I did buy their relationship, and found it to be a very fun and goofy one to watch.

Alas, I do definitely have some flaws with this movie. The final 15 minutes and the grand reveal were my two main issues. I won't spoil either of course, so you can still enjoy this film. But personally, I found the final 15 minutes of this movie to be COMPLETELY unnecessary. So much so that I was getting ready to leave at the climax of the scene before that because I thought the film was over. But no. They drag it on an extra 15 minutes and reveal what I predicted to happen. Which was my second issue. I predicted the ending BUT only because I was paying REALLY close attention to a scene and, while it may have been accidental, they reveal the ending by use of a prop. This may be just me being smart and interpreting it a weird way, or it may have been intentional, in which case then well done to those who were in charge of that. It was a very clever way to reveal it, and the people I saw this film with didn't catch on and I had to tell them about it afterwards. Despite that, I did figure it out so I can't really credit the reveal as being that good.

Something that personally didn't bother me but will bother other

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

people, is the fact that this is not a horror movie by definition. It has elements of horror movies, yes. But it is still technically a comedy movie, which is NOT what the trailers suggested at all. So I can completely understand if horror fans felt misled, therefore I do think that they should've either completely changed the marketing campaign OR included a LOT more horror elements and creepy scenes.

But aside from those flaws, I found this to be a very enjoyable movie.

It isn't going to win any awards but I can see it gaining a cult following. It was certainly fun and entertaining and I will definitely recommend you go and see it. I'll rate
Happy Death Day; 6
Creepy Masks; out of 10!

6

The premise of this film is what gives it 4 of the 6 stars I have given. It's actually a really smart plot, yet it is executed rather poorly, which is such a shame considering that if the film took itself a little more seriously, it could genuinely be put into contention as one of the great Psychological Thrillers of recent years. That is the problem, it's more
fun than
thrilling.

The story and ingenuity start to slow down as the film goes on, with both gently coming to a halt by the final 10 minutes of the film, so it's a downward slope from (pretty much) the start but it does manage to cling on to its entertainment value long enough to be worth watching.

Don't expect a masterpiece, it's just a bit of fun.

10

If you've seen Groundhog Day and Before I fall, then you should roughly know what the movie is about. The story-line is superb for it is a comedy and horror and whodunit movie all rolled into one. This is Jessica Rothe's second movie that I have seen, the Tribe being the other one. Yes I have not seen La La Land, because I hate musicals. Suffice to say Rothe is one of those actors who play their roles very convincingly. I am glad the test audience reacted furiously to the original ending of the movie and the director opted for the alternative ending. I enjoyed it therefore I recommend it. A nice change to typical Halloween season movies!

10

This movie has to be my favorite movie so far. The movie has a really great meaning to it, it's just like Groundhog Day and Scream in one movie. This movie is scary, I loved the feel of the sound effects and stuff. The jump scares were great. After the movie I went home and I could not get to sleep, I actually woke up and thought it was the same day.

Overall the movie was the best movie I have ever seen yet.

If I

could only rate 11/10.....

8

Went to movie theater with low expectations, but this movie surprised me!

I would not classify this movie as Horror/Mystery/Thriller, but as a Comedy with horror elements - it was funny, i liked all characters and plot twists.

I would definitely recommend watching it – film was executed very well and kept me entertained the whole time!

6

Happy Death Day is a movie about a university student who, on her birthday, manages to get killed by an unknown masked person. After the experience, she wakes up and realizes that she is reliving said day. While she is repeating this process, she decides to begin tracking down the person who is repeatedly slaughtering her.

Now going into this movie I didn't really expect that much. A horror movie such as this one simply looked like one where jumpscare would be very common. To an extent, I was right; there were a lot of jumpscare in this film and only a couple were effective. The first one, for instance was effective because you couldn't see it coming, but they stopped being effective directly afterwards because I had an idea where the plot was going to go with every repeated day. In a way, the movie fails at being a horror due to its predictability. This movie also has some major plot holes that I would discuss, but that would dive into spoiler territory.

As for the stuff that I enjoyed in the film, it does get entertaining sometimes and many of the jokes were pretty funny. The relationships between the main character, the love interest and the dad eventually began to grow on me. If there's one thing that the movie somewhat succeeds in as a horror, it's the fact that it does deal with some of the repercussions of fear and what it can do to one's body and that's kind of scary when you think about it.

Overall I really did enjoy this movie when it felt more like a dramedy. However, when it turns back into a horror film, for the most part Happy Death Day turns into an ineffective horror movie that is intended on using predictable jumpscare as a means to scare people, leaving that aspect of the films very weak.

6/10

7

Movie with the time loop concept is interesting but really need many good elements in it. It must contain good story, morale message, and also the brilliant plot twist is a must. And what makes this movie great ? Yeah it because Happy Death Day has all of the important element. Simple story with popular girl in university, with good

directing, the repeated scene because of time loop doesn't seem boring. They can make the audience to be curious and sometimes with extra comedy it makes this film really great !

No doubt you will like this horror thriller movie because it is not similar like usual horror movie with some ghost, devil, or mysterious phenomenon. Its more like thriller movie with mysterious psychopath that kills you and you just cant escape from it. Even if I think this movie is brilliant, I admit that with this film concept like this, I like better if the movie genre is drama because it can offer you much more emotional, dramatic, and better morale message.

6

Groundhog Day had an arrogant man trapped in a small town on the same day until he learned to appreciate those around him. Edge of Tomorrow had Tom Cruise repeating an alien invasion until he could figure a way to win it. Today's movie has someone repeating not just their birthday, but the day that they are killed by a psychopath. I've mentioned before that on paper, time loop stories are a great way to get to know the person suffering the consequence of reliving the day. On camera, the trick is harder as the story has to remain consistent without being too repetitive.

The idea of someone having to repeat their birthday is an interesting

one, considering that the older one gets, the less they care about the day that celebrates that. It may be a morose notion, but it's about the college age in which people would rather draw attention on the celebration rather than the number factor. I myself celebrated my thirtieth by taking a vacation and having dinner with the family. The movie not only gives us a character who could care less that she has a birthday, but an extra layer that I won't give away. So Happy Death Day may have a little extra for the time loop story.

A snobbish college girl Theresa (played by Jessica Rothe) wakes up in the dorm room of fellow student Carter (played by Israel Broussard). Though he tries to make small talk, she leaves to go back to her sorority. She spends the day being rude and pretentious to everyone including her roommate Lori. She's also the other girl in an affair with her professor and even ignores her father's invitation to a birthday lunch. On her way to a party, she is stalked by a hooded figure wearing her school's mascot image as a mask. She is killed; but wakes up the same morning; in the same dorm room of Carter.

She initially dismisses the previous night as a dream and goes on her day again; only to get killed. When she realizes she's repeating the same day over and over, she's suggested to use that time to follow potential suspects. Each day ends in death and summons her back to the beginning, but the twist is that with each day, she is growing weaker from the injuries. So despite the safety of the time loop, there seems to be a clock that is getting closer to midnight as Theresa is trying to solve her murder.

The whole time loop formula has been done before, but I

like how Happy

Death Day has used it in a horror context. Did it generate a scary movie? Well… I'd say that while it's shot in a suspenseful tone, it doesn't generate that many scares. I'd argue that the tone is not even full horror, but I'll get to that in a moment. But going back to it's use on the time loop, I think they did it well. I also like that they establish that her body is still vulnerable to damage from the murders, otherwise it would seem like there were no consequence.

I'll say that I really enjoyed Jessica Rothe in the lead. For someone who initially has to start the film in an unlikable manner, she carries the story and really makes you want to see her redeem herself.

What the marketing seems to hide is that Happy Death Day is a part comedy. While I'm no sure why the trailers didn't want to spoil that notion, but I laughed more then I thought I was going. Because the film is still trying to be scary, it does suffer from inconsistency. I think it would have made sense to try and be a little more funny, something in the vein of Evil Dead or Drag Me to Hell. That would at least justify the PG-13 rating that is hindering this story of it's full potential. Those hoping for a lot of blood are not going to see it. I'll also bet that the film war originally produced with an R rating, only to get cut down to try and get in a teenage audience. Come on! Teenagers are already aware of these kinds of college dangers. They would have been fine with an R rating.

I'll give this six red birthday candles out of ten. Happy Death Day feels like a great movie that was edited by cowards who thought they knew what was best. I doubt ill see this again as it is, but I'll be on the lookout for a directors cut. Maybe that'll add back in that extra violence and jokes that are apparently too much for the studio

10

Denis Villeneuve, you magnificent world wonder, you did it again!

I have seen this film three times in the cinema, in 3D, 2D and 4DX.

And one of the things i have noticed with this film, is that it's not the time in the cinema that takes up my time, It's the hours upon hours in between spent thinking about the film, that is the real time consumer. This film left such a deep and profound impact, which i cannot escape. And I've gone back to the cinema twice to be "tortured", but it's worth it.

It's a dark, mysterious, grim, hopeless, sad and lonely film, set in a possible near future where the human race is hanging by their fingertips on the edge of doom. So it's quite depressing. But it's so brilliantly put together, the closest master of cinema i think of that has done something similar, is Stanley Kubrick.

Many Stanley Kubrick films were also "hated" by many when they first released. "2001: A Space Odyssey" for example, which had gorgeous visuals, but felt flat and hollow for many, even professional reviewers

back then. But what Kubrick did best with his films, was to create afterthought. People left the cinema feeling confused and even depressed, but the movies planted a seed which then grew for years. The original Blade Runner also accomplished this. BR2049 is no exception, this movie will without doubt live on to be interpreted, analyzed and discussed for decades to come. The story continues from the original, but stands completely on its own, it tells a new story that directly interlink with the original, but without trying to be a copy, it's a natural continuation in the same universe. You don't have to see the original Blade Runner first, though i do recommend it, see the final cut.

BR2049 has some of the most gorgeous visuals i have ever seen, and the cinematography is out of this world, there is literally no excuse not to give Roger Deakins the Oscar this time. After 13 nominations he has now knocked the ball out of the park and is this year in his own league entirely. It's confusing to look at something so gorgeous, whilst painting a picture of such a sad and lost world. It sort of collides with your senses, your eyes say it's beautiful, your mind say it's depressing. Which senses are you going to believe? What does it mean? At least don't confuse feeling depressed as a sign that this movie is bad, it's nothing wrong feeling depressed, take it in, embrace it. Then you will know how it feels to be a replicant that's trapped in a caged mind.

BR2049's story happens 30 years after the original, and there is three

short films on Youtube i recommend you watch. These short films describes some of what happened in between 2019 and 2049. Watching them makes it slightly easier to understand some of the things going on. But the underlying theme is the same as it was in the original. What does it mean to be human? What does it mean to have memories? What is a soul? And so on.

The world has gone darker in 2049, climate is spinning out of control, almost all animals and plants have died. People are desperate and lost, law enforcement can barely keep anything together, and only a small spark can set of total disaster, which is looming just around every corner. Niander Wallace has taken over Tyrell Corp and has by the time 2049 takes place designed millions of obedient replicants that does exactly what he tells them to do. But there is one thing Wallace has not been able to perfect, and that's what the main story is all about, and Wallace will do anything in his power to get his hands on the technology, which will result in him becoming many hundred times richer and more powerful, the sole ruler of the entire universe. He is so far gone in his mind by 2049 he actually believes he is god himself, and he calls his replicants angels.

And of course he also uses replicants to do his dirty work. In 2049 we meet his right hand girl; Luv (Brilliantly played by Sylvia Hoeks, if there is one actor in this movie that steal the show, it's her). Luv is a handygirl; so to speak, that perform whatever task she is set to do, with no remorse. Or is that entirely true? I can't spoil anything, but look closely at Luv's character arc. All the other actors also do

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

an outstanding job in this film, no bad performances, but i can't talk about all of them due to the word limit in these reviews.

Be prepared going to see this film, it's depressing and heavy on your mind, and it demands your full attention. It's one of those rare films who dares to challenge the audience, and by doing so, taking a huge risk, and a 155 million dollar risk at that. The film isn't perfect, but it's close, and it shows the tremendous skills of Denis Villeneuve. And those few mistakes this movie have, are probably just happy little accidents as Rob Ross would have put it. This film is very much like a painting, every stroke of the brush matters, and every little detail is carefully crafted, it takes monumental skills to pull it off.

I loved this film, it's the best film I've seen all year, It is a must see, a monumental triumph of a film that's just as good (possibly even better) as the original and one of the best sequels of all time!

9.7/10 - Masterpiece

And BTW Villeneuve's next movie might be Dune, imagine if he brings Deakins and the rest of this team to make that movie. Yeah, I'm going to leave you with that thought. This is basically porn.

10

Let me start by saying that I am a huge Denis Villeneuve fan and absolutely love every movie he made, from his breakthrough drama 'Incendies' to the action thriller 'Sicario'. But when I learned that he was going to make a sequel to Ridley Scott's iconic Blade Runner I had mixed feelings. Would he be able to live up to the expectations and make a sequel that could measure itself with the original? For this reason, I went into the cinema thinking ''This will be a great movie, I am a Villeneuve fan so I have to like it'' but that was a mistake, for once I stopped expecting and just started experiencing the film, I was enchanted by all of its visual beauty. I was wrong to doubt Villeneuve; his 'Blade Runner 2049' even succeeds in transcending in some ways the original masterpiece, especially as a visual experience.

The bleak dystopian future Scott so perfectly created is even more beautiful in Villeneuve's 2049, for which a lot of credit has to be given to the brilliant director of photography Roger Deakins, who has made one of his best works (which says a lot). Every shot is brilliant, I loved every single frame and I cannot imagine that he wouldn't get nominated and win an Oscar for this phenomenal work. But also a big thumbs up has to be given to the entire effects team, for Deakins didn't do it all on his own.

Deakins isn't the only mastermind at work, for the score is also beautifully done. When I learned that composer Jóhann Jóhannsson (someone who has collaborated multiple times with Villeneuve and did most of the scores for his movies) got fired I was surprised; Jóhannsson has always delivered great work, but according to Villeneuve, his score ''wasn't the right one'' for this

movie for it

didn't ''resemble Vangelis soundtrack for Blade Runner'' quite enough.

So he got replaced by probably the best man in the business nowadays; Hans Zimmer. And as we are used to with the German composer, this was once again sublime and a great homage to the original. Zimmer's 2049 score can be compared to his Dunkirk score, in a way that it unsettles us from the first chord and just as the Second World War movie, it keeps us on the edges of our seats, especially during the last hour.

As for the people who are actually situated in front of the camera, they all play their parts very well. I was especially happy that Ryan Gosling's agent K was indeed the leading man and he did a very good job. I was slightly concerned that it would mostly be about Harrison Ford's Deckard, but luckily that wasn't the case. Nevertheless, Ford gives one of his best performances in years and after all the iconic roles he played once again in recent years (Han Solo, Indiana Jones) this is by far the best. The smaller but important roles are also noteworthy; Robin Wright's Lieutenant Joshi makes a fierce and convincing police chief, while the villain duo Jared Leto's Neander Wallace as the evil head of a corporation at the top of the new world order and his frightening hit-woman Luv (Sylvia Hoeks) are also very impressive. Last but not least, Ana de Armas is also very good as Joi, K's girlfriend (even if she does remind me a lot of Scarlet Johansson in 'Her' and slightly of Alicia Vikander in 'Ex Machina';, but maybe

that's something Villeneuve did that on purpose and wanted to pay homage to these recent but also very good science-fiction movies).

That said, Villeneuve will receive most of the credit, as he should.

For unlike most of Hollywood's blockbusters nowadays, he doesn't simply deliver us a spectacle with some nice effects or a reboot of the original, but he picks up the threads where Scott left, which was a monumental task, for the original 'Blade Runner' is one of the most impressive and iconic movies ever made. 2049 continues on the same topics raised by the original, making the sequel worth the 35-year long wait; it goes further with what was proposed in the first installment, enriching one another. It is possible that one day a third installment could be made, but that is only if any director will ever find the courage to make another 'Blade Runner';, for the bar is raised incredibly high. I believe that in time, 'Blade Runner 2049' will just as the original one, grow into a cult movie, and rightfully so, for it is its own movie, but, just as the original, a visually remarkable, achingly human sci-fi masterpiece.

I am not going to say more about it, because the studio has been

unusually insistent in its pleas to critics and the first movie viewers not to reveal any plot points, but I am glad they did. Even if I could go on and on about the movie and the difference between replicants and humans (or is there really much of a difference, after all?) the less you know the better, because 2049 feels at its best when it surprises

(which is one of Villeneuve's greatest strengths). This is a movie best experienced on the biggest screen in your cinema; trust me, it will be worth your while. As for me, I will most likely try and make some free time in my schedule for the coming days, 'cause I want to go the cinema again, guess what I'm gonna watch...

10

For film fanatics like myself, Blade Runner 2049 is a great film for people to see, regardless if they've witnessed the original or not. On the other hand, if you've never seen the original Blade Runner and are just a casual moviegoer that have thought of the promotion for this film as being an action-packed thrill ride, then I'd have to warn to stay far away from this near three hour motion picture. It's very hard to review this film without getting into specific plot details, but that's exactly what makes this film worth the price of admission alone. For nearly every reason a film fan should be excited about a movie, here is why Blade Runner 2049 is a must see as soon as possible.

Before dropping you into this world with Ryan Gosling's character, there is text at the beginning that will fill you in on the history of the events in the past, but even though that information is given to you, your experience just won't be the same without having viewed the first film multiple times and remembering the emotional core of it. Set out on a mission to find something of meaning to the overall story, Ryan Gosling's character (who will remain nameless for the sake of this review) uncovers mysteries and secrets from the past, inevitably involving Rick Deckard. Quite honestly, that's the plot in a nutshell and the specifics of the film will lead to ruining your experience, so let's get technical.

If not for anything else, Blade Runner 2049 benefits from some of the best cinematography I've laid my eyes on in years. From the addition of the seamlessly blended visual effects, to the mind- blowing scenery constructed by the entire art department, I have nothing but praise for this film. Whether or not you find yourself enjoying your experience, the visuals alone should have you applauding, due to their incredibly detailed nature. I personally found the overall film to be magnificent, but when certain scenes were dialogue-free and asking you to gasp at the imagery, that's exactly what I was doing, as I feel many audiences members will.

Again, without giving anything away, once Rick Deckard (Harrison Ford) enters the picture, the way both films sort of interconnect was brilliant in my opinion. It does justice to any loose ends that fans may have wanted in the past, as well as create a new story to gawk at in the process. With a terrifically restrained performance by Ryan Gosling, you'll find yourself sucked into this world as a fly on the wall, as he uncovers these mysteries. With the addition of Harrison Ford giving one of his most sincere and memorable performances, as well as Ana de Armas in a role that really took me by surprise, this film

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

was casted to the nines from beginning to end. Some may complain about Jared Leto and Dave Bautista not being included as much, but I felt as though they served the story quite nicely.

In the end, this movie aims to impress Sci-Fi fans across the world, but I feel as though the people who will be looking back on this as a possible classic or at least one of the best sequels ever made, are those who've had the pleasure of indulging in the greatness that is 1982's Blade Runner. I don't say this about films very often, especially when talking about sequels, but I haven't been this immersed in a theatrical experience in quite some time. This is definitely a superior film than the original, it's one of the best films of 2017, and I'll be revisiting it very soon. Blade Runner 2049 is getting a lot of praise and awards consideration from critics and filmgoers across the world, and every bit of it is deserved. Aside from being very long, this is pretty much a perfect film if you don't try to nitpick how it connects and certain questions that aren't blatantly answered. If you know what type of film you're in for, or you've at least seen the original and enjoyed it, I can't recommend this movie enough.

10

Blade Runner 2049 is the sequel to the 1982 sci-fi classic Blade Runner. Directed by Denis Villeneuve (Arrival, Sicario) and once again based on Philip K. Dick's novel Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?, it successfully recaptures just about everything excellent about the original and is a superb sequel to one of the greatest and most important science fiction films of all time.

Thirty years after the events of the first film, LAPD Officer K (Ryan Gosling) works as a Blade Runner, retiring old rogue replicants (artificial humans) hiding out around the Los Angeles area. One day while on a job, K discovers a long buried secret in the yard of a replicant which leads him on a journey to track down former Blade Runner Rick Deckard (Harrison Ford), who has been missing for decades.

Featuring amazing visuals and some of the most philosophical and thought-provoking themes since the original, Blade Runner 2049 is a masterpiece of science fiction and is possibly one of the greatest sequels ever made. I was transfixed the entire time, to the point where I felt that even blinking would cause me to miss something I wanted to see. The cast was brilliant as well, especially Ryan Gosling, who does a fantastic job carrying the film as its lead actor. However, perhaps best of all, is that seeing the original is not a requirement to fully understand everything that is going on, although it would probably still help to have done so beforehand. I'm almost certain that author Philip K. Dick would be proud of this film. I know I am.

I rate it a very high 9.5/10

3

I never was one of those people asking for a Blade Runner sequel. Now that Blade Runner 2049 is out, my position still stands. This film is simply a massive letdown and nothing more.

The year is 2049 and the world has grown in technology, but not humanity. Ryan Gosling plays K, a Blade Runner (a futuristic cop) tasked with tracking down the last of the Replicants-androids that look like humans. Knowing that he himself is a replicant, he goes on a journey of his own when he finds a box containing the bones of a Replicant who gave birth to a child and is tasked with finding the child. Little does he know that the new head of the Tyrell Corporation that makes the Replicants, Mr. Wallace (Jared Leto), plans to use the missing child for his own purposes and kill K if he has to.

My main problem with the film is that it was unforgivably boring. The film is two hours and forty-five minutes long, which is already enough to test one's patience (and bladder), but it feels so deliberately paced; the characters almost always move so slow, that it feels like the filmmakers thought that it was the best way to pad out the running time, despite having not enough material to justify it.

The performances range from great to laughable. Harrison Ford is hardly in the movie, and his inclusion is clearly a marketing ploy, but he gives the best performance in his brief running time and he feels like a continuation of his character from the original, Deckard, in a world where things have just gotten worse. Gosling isn't bad as K, and his stone-face actually is pretty effective in a couple of scenes, but Rutger Hauer in the original gave his Replicant character more of a personality. Leto is trying and failing to bring a degree of menace as the villain, and his female Replicant sidekick competes with him in the field of phoning it in.

What else shocked me was how unsubtle the film was. The original was not only a futuristic crime noir that had Harrison Ford's Deckard chasing down androids, but also a personal journey involving himself and Rutger Hauer as the villain that involved trying to find a degree of humanity in such a futuristic world, and that maybe, Deckard is a replicant himself. Here, the story is mainly of Gosling trying to come to terms with the fact that he is a Replicant and what it means in terms of his humanity. Whereas in the original, there were subtle signs, images, and bits of dialogue that hinted at Deckard's purpose in the original, everything is spelled out for the audience to the point that old bits of dialogue are repeated thrice at important moments. It doesn't respect the audience's intelligence at all. The first and final thirds of the film are mainly filled with dialogue that is basically speeches that preach ideas about conflict and the ethics of machines, but hardly any of it is explored in an interesting fashion. What's worse, the film feels so empty and devoid that for a time, I forgot what K's objective was.

What I will say is that the cinematography is beautiful. There are a lot of colorful images with ancient ruins and futuristic tech in the background and foreground that could easily pass as being part of an

art gallery. The only downside is that there is too much gray in some shots and it feels too clean compared to the original.

Why Warner Brothers and Sony wasted their time making this film, I have no clue. Maybe it was Ridley Scott's fault. After being unimpressed with his Alien: Covenant earlier this year (and was also quite the snooze-fest), watching this only proved to me further that Scott just doesn't care about good filmmaking anymore. Denis Villeneuve is clearly an ambitious director, but his style didn't feel completely right for this film. Clearly, in a film that tries so desperately to say much more humanity than its predecessor, it comes out feeling empty and feels less human than the original did.

P.S. A lot of people have accused me of being too shallow and wanting this film to be more action packed. I do not have that mindset. I enjoy films that take their time as much as the next film enthusiast, but this one just didn't do enough to justify what it was aiming for. I'm not ashamed in expressing my opinion. Just let me be clear on something: going at a slow, deliberate pace and speaking lines of preachy dialogue does not, I repeat, does not equal intelligence. The positive reviews baffle me, especially on Rotten Tomatoes. Sony owns the company, which leads me to think that maybe it bribed more than a few critics in the hopes that more people would see it. Clearly, that is backfiring and I'm happy that people are rejecting it.

3

In 1982 I was deeply excited about the prospect of seeing Blade Runner, and can remember applying for a chance to see an advance showing in Sacramento. From the start it seemed obvious that it was a special film--clouded in controversy and mystery. Later I acquired my much-viewed VHS copy, with all the eye-gouging, nail-puncturing violence. Later still the Internet provided background information as, eventually, did articles plus a comprehensive book by Paul M. Sammon. In short, I am a fan, and was eagerly anticipating the sequel.

So, it was with disappointment that I left an October 6, 2017 showing of Blade Runner 2049. Overly long, boring, poorly paced, and confusing were my initial impressions, though admittedly it was beautifully filmed (potential Oscar nomination in cinematography?).

I appreciated the many (too many?) subtle and not-so-subtle nods to the original film, the effort to build on the Blade Runner universe, and efforts by writers, directors, and actors to bring the story to life. But there were just too many scenes that should have been reduced in length from 25-50% of their run time. Such excess in a film is, to me, almost always a fatal flaw. And some scenes (e.g., where characters Joi and Mariette merge to make love to K;) could have been cut altogether, I feel, without harming the story.

The acting was satisfactory or better, for the most part, as one would expect from the level of supporting talent.* However, I have knowingly

seen two pictures starring Ryan Gosling's 2016's La La Land; and now

this;and in both he is bland and wooden. Despite the fact that

2049's;

K; is SUPPOSED to be a self-controlled, artificial humanoid, I wonder if it is just Gosling's natural on- (and off-) screen persona. And frankly, Harrison Ford's Deckard; just did not work for me.

Sacrilegious, I know; but true. I blame this on two factors.

First, Ford appears (too) late in the movie, by which time I was

already exhausted by tedium. Second, for a character without appearance-changing makeup, a dramatic accent, say, or pronounced behavioral distinctions, it is hard not to just see Harrison Ford.

(Kind of like Robert Redford miscast in 1985's Out of Africa;) Oh, it's (old) Harrison Ford again. Sorry HF fans everywhere.

And another thing; due to poor direction, they included Admiral

William Adama; (Edward James Olmos) from TV's Battlestar Galactica;

and not Gaff; (also Olmos), in a too brief cameo. (Listen to Gaff; in

the 1982 original. Totally different voicing.)

Like most films, it suffered from its share of Oh, come on! moments.

Why would 6-foot K; allow 6-foot-6 Dave Bautista's imposing Sapper

Morton; to make the first move (and thus begin the accumulation of a ridiculous amount of damage, most of it unnecessary, sustained by K; throughout the story)? Because that's what movie detectives do. I must say, K; apparently likes to pass violently through solid walls (a nod to Rutger Hauer's Roy Batty; head in the original, I take it).

Almost all action-adventure films are silly in hindsight and full of movie plot cliché's; Blade Runner 20149; is no exception. But the test

of a good movie is whether the story flows at a pace that makes audiences subconsciously accept and even relish these otherwise nonsensical encumbrances (see 1999's The Matrix;). For my part I was less inclined to give 2049; a pass on the silliness due to its plodding nature.

Ridley Scott is prominently associated with both the recent Alien; and

Blade Runner; franchises, and has promised multiple sequels. Do we want this? Is state-of-the-art movie-making worth either ridiculously poor stories (the Alien; franchise) or bad plotting and editing (Blade Runner 2049;)? It's admittedly hard to make a good movie, but Scott and his people are paid a LOT of money to do so. Check Scott's IMDb filmography. Can any mortal be involved first-hand in that many projects? As with Stephen King, maybe it's time to stop the quantity and re-focus on the quality? Just saying

In conclusion, my disappointment focused primarily on the script and editing.**

Some recommendations to potential viewers: First, if you plan to see

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

"Blade Runner 2049" it will help to see one of 37 versions (e.g., voice-over or no voice-over?; graphic violence shots or not?) of the original 1982 film beforehand. Second, maybe wait to watch the movie digitally, so that you can re-play key scenes and increase volume on important dialogue. In the theater I kept mentally reaching for a non-existent remote control. Third, (after Recommendation One) if like me you hold the original picture in deep admiration as a flawed but intriguing analog masterpiece of SF movie-making, consider skipping this sequel altogether. But I imagine that warning will fall on deaf ears.

* Because of the look and feel of two female characters in the film, I wonder if actresses Felicity Jones ("Rogue One") and Tatiana Maslany ("Orphan Black") were originally considered for the parts eventually played by Ana de Armas (companion hologram "Joi") and Sylvia Hoeks (deadly replicant "Luv"). While watching the trailer footage, I originally mistook those two characters for actresses Jones and Maslany. Their doppelgangers did just fine, though. Hoeks' "Luv" is particularly chilling.

** Oh, and the music! Not so good. Too often I was aware of background music--that by itself is not a good thing--and its shortcomings. So much so that by the end of "2049," where original "Blade Runner" music ("Tears in the Rain," I think) is (finally) used, it left me with mixed feelings. First, thank god! Second, where was that musical excellence during the rest of the film? Music can make or break a film, and is incredibly important. Few excellent films have poor musical soundtracks. Unfortunately, "Blade Runner 2049" is not an exception to that guideline.

5

...the return of the giant Atari sign from the original Blade Runner.

OK, quick story synopsis. Bones found of a Replicant who's given birth. How was it possible and where is the child (now adult)?

I'm sorry, but having waited 35 years for this movie it just didn't press any buttons for me. It's an hour too long, the story-line is weak to non-existent and doesn't get answered, the theory of Deckard's origin is again teased at but not answered (even though there really is very little in the original to point to him being a replicant).

This is another SFX over substance movie. Looks good, although very dark in the 3D version, but there just doesn't seem to be the energy and edginess of the original. It all seems too NICE.

Having seen the original movie over 30 times, I'm not sure I'll bother returning to this new story. I have to agree with Rutger Hauer about trying to add to a perfect movie.

3

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

The first movie (which should have stayed the only movie) is a masterpiece of sci fi. I was hooked from the start great story and for the time great FX also cannot beat the soundtrack by Vangelis.

Not sure what is going on with Ridley Scott first with is Alien Covenant he destroyed the series there and now with the new addition of blade runner.

I feel that all the positive reviews for this movie are fake, because the movie is a sad excuse to make money and makes no sense at all, no surprised it failed this weekend at the box office.

The acting is good so are the special effects, but the story is weak and none existent, Tyrell corporation is gone and there is a new company that makes the replicans, and tyrell had found a way for them to reproduce and have babies.

This is where the story gets weird, Deckard is brought back into the mix because he had a child with Rachel.

The movie also lack action and in the end does not explain anything. I felt like a huge waste of 2h and a half.

35y in the making for this wow just wow.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
1

The original Blade Runner is one of my favourite films so I was really looking forward to this one. What a disappointment. If I wasn't in the company of others I would of walked out early. I left the cinema feeling annoyed that I had to sit through this overlong monotonous film. The storyline is dragged out with the main character just going from place to place to investigate something like in a video game. At the beginning he is in a fight scene and you find out he is basically indestructible. The replicants are now terminators. This leaves out any suspense that he is in danger. The first film was kind of believable, the city was overcrowded and the building were decaying - it had atmosphere. This one looked like a more modern city with a lot of emptiness. The technology has advanced so much that he now has a solid light fully realistic AI holographic companion that operates from a small device he can keep in his pocket. If you think about it why are they so desperate to increase replicant slave labour production when they are capable of building AI robots that can be enveloped with holographic light to look human. They still have the blurry 1950 TV quality monitors to echo the first film but the supposed technology jump does not make sense. The music by Vangelis was one of the most important parts of the original. He conveyed through the use of synthesisers and traditional instruments a sense of awe and wonder, beauty and the sadness of a dystopian world. Johann Johannsson was originally commissioned to score the film and I think he would of done a great job but they decided for some reason it was not Hollywood sounding enough so they bought in Hans Zimmer. What a disaster. It might as well be the music from Batman VS Alien. Just lots of loud

noise. The original was a box office failure that became a cult classic. This is just a failure.

2

SPOILERS ALERT: The biggest difference between 1982 masterpiece and this one is that in the first film everything is happening at a normal speed. In original movie people talk like they talk in real life, their move at perfectly normal, every day, common speed, it doesn't take them forever to finish the sentence, or to shape out a thought, and yet... somehow it all works perfectly together.

There's no way to know how will people (let alone robots) act or talk in thirty plus years, but if it is to be anything like in BR2049, I suspect it will be a pretty bleak and exhausting world.

From the moment one, everybody talks, walks, plays, runs in some super-strange slow-mo: I'd say at 50% of the normal speed. It takes 10 seconds for poor Ryan Gosling only to take out something from his pocket. Not to say how long it takes him to walk through the scene - so much that half way through, let's say, the orphanage part, I have already forgotten what is he doing there in the first place.

20 minutes into the movie, all I'm doing is wondering when this shot is going to end, when this scene is going to end, when the sequence will, and, ultimately, when the movie is going to end. This is not the way to pay a homage, to anybody or anything.

There is a reason why the shots in "2001 Odyssey..." are that long, somebody should've warned the director about that. And there's also a reason why all shots in the original BR are that tight. And that's just one of the reasons to why both 2001 and BR are masterpieces. And for that same reason, BR2049 could that never be.

You don't drag out every single aspect of the movie just to make it seem serious or pretend to be an artist, no. If you do, you get very expensive, anemic boredom. I have no idea why the director did it - he hasn't done it in that fairly fair movie with Hugh Jackman. What possessed him to do it here? Was it the importance of the first movie? Was it his fear to look like a schoolboy in front of the Master? Don't know, don't care.

What a waste of great actors, class all - forcing them to engage in some sort of quasi elevated, quasi profound, but genuinely bizarre ballet that has nothing, nothing, nothing to do with the real life. The movie is three hours plus long only for the given reason - it would have been an hour shorter if had played out at normal pace.

Oh - and to end here - the biggest dread of all: a hint of a possible franchise. Please, please, please people, for the love of all that's holly. Don't.

5

Please be aware that my review contains spoilers so please do not read

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

further if you do want to have key plot points revealed.

First things first, I'm a big fan of the original and have enjoyed immensely with each viewing, first from when I was a 10 year old until 2 weeks ago so I was interested to see what Villeneuve would do with the sequel.

Watched it Saturday and must say the experience left me somewhat underwhelmed and frustrated at seeing such an opportunity to do something original go to waste, that I have decided to post my thoughts here on IMDb for the first time.

In no particular here are some of my questions and general points about the film.

Jared Leto's performance. How the hell is he such a high paid star? I cannot think of anything he is particularly memorable and this is no exception.

His eyes. Are they distracting on purpose?

If his character saved the world from starvation, how come there aren't millions of people worshiping him? Humans are suckers for finding idols and why shouldn't his character be any different. Crikey, we have dictators in our world who had days and months of the year named after family members.

Why doesn't he have a massive army organised to hunt down Deckard instead of entrusting this to one replicant and a few goons?

Monologues giving exposition is lazy storytelling and old Wallace loves a monologue.

What is his plan? He wants to produce more replicants but kills one at the start for some spurious reason. Hint hint, to show the audience he is a very naughty. He also has the Rachel replicant killed. No wonder he cannot make enough replicants if he keeps killing them.

Ryan Gosling plays Ryan Gosling again and although I don't dislike his performances, I find it hard to root for his character here, as I've seen it before in a much better film (Drive).

The music wasn't particularly memorable and only made me think of the much better soundtrack from Bladerunner. Apparently this was intentional on Villeneuve's part as he removed the original composer who wanted to do something original. So instead, the director opted for Zimmer to make it more Bladerunnery and therefore less memorable for this film.

The film did not merit or need the run-time it had. I appreciate the original BR took its time but it had a new world to show us

The ending was goofy and ridiculous. Why would K bring Deckard to his daughter who is the most wanted person in the history of want people? This will definitely endanger her given that Leto's character has a relationship with her and probably has her under some sort of surveillance.

Hero comes back from the dead to say the day cliché; at end was extremely predictable and had me rolling my eyes, which I shouldn't be doing the first time I watch a film.

The blackout sounds like a much more interesting story than this. Caused by replicants? A solar flare? Was there a Trump two term presidency in this universe?

Robots reproducing and creating their own has

already been cover in
Battlestar Galactica, who did it in a more compelling fashion with
characters and stakes I cared about

Plus, how come Leto's character
hasn't figured out on to get replicants
to reproduce? Why can't he produce them faster? How many has he killed
before delivering a monologue

Some of the visuals are stunning though lack
depth or colour. The
future looks fairly boring in comparison to Bladerunner 1982, which
offered some very unusual street shots and characters. One included a
guy with a eagle on his head. Nothing to really catch the eye in
BR2049.

Why not have Rachel as leader of the rebellion instead of some
random
person the audience has no connection with.

When the capture Deckard, why on
earth wouldn't they kill K?

How did K know how to find the car with
Dekard at the end? We don't
see him doing any investigative work to discover this information,
despite the long run time.

They made a replicant clone of Rachel but get the
eye colour wrong?
Seriously?

How heavy handed was the prejudice? No subtlety whatsoever.
Jeepers,
you spend all that money on effects but then go minimum wage on screen
writers.

That sex scene reminded me of Ghost with all the syncing going on.
Watching Whoopi do her thing was just as sexy as watching this scene,
despite it having two incredibly attractive women present, along with
Ryan Gosling who is no slouch himself in the looks department.

The replicant
rebellion feels shoehorned in rather than something which
has grown and developed organically. Need to take lessons from Star
Wars on how to introduce a rebel alliance story.

The golden rule of cinema is
broken here when they show/play clips from
a much better film.

Critics are only offering gushing praise for a film with
considerable
flaws because they don't wish to get caught out like the critics of 82.
Back then, the critics hated it because they couldn't see the hidden
depth, this time they see depth that simply isn't there. Even one of
the character says something along these lines to another.

1

BR2049 has more plot holes than emmental cheese and one big 'plot
twist'; that I won't mention, not because it would spoil much, but
because if you decide to watch this movie, you deserve to be
disappointed by its stupidity.

The big 'twist' is mentioned as the
'miracle', but it is absolutely
idiotic and illogical from the point of view of a manufacturer of
replicants. How did 'that' might have ever be considered a good idea?
One would assume that after the disaster of the Nexus 6 series, Tyrell
Co. and his successors would have invented some more reliable security
system - such as a lower level of self-consciousness, way safer than

the questionable "obedience" of the Nexus 8. Or even something like all the androids looking the same, so that they can be easily detected and you would not need blade runners to locate and eliminate them.

Anything that would provide humanity with useful, free labor without ethical problems… But no, in this movie ethical problems just got exponentially bigger. And so much for a science so advanced as to reproduce perfect bodies and minds...

Besides, since it is established that humankind sucks, I failed to understand how replicants are in any way better, since they just want to be more "like humans";….

On the visual side, BR2049 sucks, too. Looks like they used random leftovers scenery from other Sc-Fi/disaster movies, from the overused industrial background of Terminator to the desertic blurred landscape of MadMax and the inevitable nightmarish city-scape, which looks like Blade Runner, but on cheap side. Costumes looks like the contemporary drab clothing promoted by Nordic high street chains: lots of dark, cheap-looking leggings and stretchy tops, a far cry from the decadent, elaborate futuristic/retro suits of BR.

In one scene, Deckard meets Tyrell's successor in a closed room filled with water, except a square island in the middle. A room that has no other reason to exist except bringing back memories of the "original" Tyrell building.

The dialog is unbelievable bad and scenes drag on forever. When the Goslin character finds Deckard, the two spend over ten minutes fighting and chasing each other, when a couple of lines of dialogue would have avoided that.

The ending is both manipulative and plagiarist: it wants to move the audience, recreating the amazing poetic moment of Roy Batty's death, but using snow instead of rain. If nothing else, the ending would have been enough to put me off this piece of commercial garbage.

8

I've only seen the original Blade Runner once and it was a long time ago. I liked it but I just haven't got around to revisiting it. I mention this because even though I'm not a die-hard fan of Blade Runner, I still found the plot of 2049 engrossing. It's a well put together mystery, I found that they constantly took the plot in unexpected directions and other than the trailer spoiling the return of Deckard, I was always excited about what was going to happen next. The movie pulls an excellent bait and switch at the end that really surprised me. They made the right decision to not repeat the formula of the first one and take the story to a new place. They also create some compelling subplots which is something that few movies get right.

The biggest star of this movie is the cinematography and the excellent work of Roger Deakins. The original was noteworthy with the special environment that Ridley Scott and his creative team brought to the screen. That was continued here if not improved upon. The look of L.A.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

in 2049 they decided to go with isn't completely distinct but it was a little more understated (I'd compare it to the 2017 Ghost in the Shell but less fantastical). My favourite scene might have been a shootout in a defunct club where the lighting and the background show are turning on and off. I don't hesitate to praise when a movie looks good but this is an exemplary example of using visuals and atmosphere to help build on a strong story.

Blade Runner 2049 returns very few of the characters from the original

film but they manage to breathe life into this movie through the new ones they created. Officer K isn't the most lively protagonist but he gets an eye-opening character arc that kept me involved. Deckard doesn't appear till later in the movie but he remains interesting and what they decide to do with him makes his appearance worthwhile. I also really liked some of the smaller supporting characters. Sapper really helps kick off the movie, what Joi represents is extremely emotional and Mariette is so mysterious that her involvement brings up more and more questions. Add in that Niander Wallace and Luv make for pretty menacing villains and you have a pretty well-rounded and fascinating script.

I don't think that the actors/actresses will be the focal point of the

awards attention that this movie will get but that doesn't mean there aren't exemplary performances. Gosling is good as K, he's deliberately robotic and he accomplishes a lot through his subtlety. Harrison Ford isn't in the movie as much as I wanted him to be (he's still one of my all-time favourite actors) but he holds up his end. He works with Gosling well and they have a solid rapport. Surprisingly, I really liked Sylvia Hoeks. She stole a lot of her scenes and I thought she was great even acting against a stacked cast. Dave Bautista showed he has a lot more range than people give him credit for. Jared Leto is in a very Jared Leto role (deliberately weird and hard to understand) but he does it well and although he might be a little creepy, the guy is still a great actor. I also want to credit Ana de Armas, she was distinctly warm and she showed a lot more emotion than I had seen from her previously.

There were points in this movie I could have rated this a 9/10 but some

small things that I had to dock the movie for. Even with a compelling story, the movie has such a long run time that it couldn't help but drag. There are certain scenes where the movie wants you to really drink in the environment but they could have edited it a little tighter. They also couldn't help but lose me at points through how much artistic flair they utilize. Villeneuve is an authority in this area and while I appreciate an artistic approach to this science fiction tale, for me they overdid it a little.

I was surprised how much I ended up liking Blade Runner 2049. I think

if you're a big fan of the original, you'll love this to bits. This is successful in bringing in the uninitiated but I think fans will enjoy this even more. I haven't been on board for all of Villeneuve's films but this is a good combination of his artistic style with enough of a

commercial element for the masses. I'd give this somewhere between an 8-9 but with the extremely long run time, I'll give this an 8/10.

8

So, I didn't expect much from this sequel when it was announced, but since the original Blade Runner is, in my opinion, one of the greatest movies ever made (if not the greatest), I had to see it anyways. As I often do, I didn't read any reviews or watch any trailers before going.

So, where do we start... While not perfect, and inferior to the original, this is still a great movie. Visually it's simply stunning and the actors are all excellent. Just as importantly, or maybe even more so, like the original it combines a slow pace and fantastic ambiance to create an introspective mood and invite reflection on some important themes and issues of our time. (although, maybe, lacking a dialogue with the same power as the Roy Batty monologue at the end of the first movie).

As some negative reviewers said, it is slow..... but that works well with the story and its intent to create a very clear, pervasive mood rather than to dazzle with dumb car chases, gunfights, or explosions, not to mention pushing the viewer to form his own opinions. The boring part is subjective: for viewers who like to be challenged intellectually I'd say many action movies are a lot more boring. Nothing wrong with escapist movies, which I also enjoy when I'm in the right mood, but it doesn't change the fact that they're inherently much more predictable, superficial and formulaic. In other words, entertaining but intellectually boring.

Regarding Blade Runner 2049, one disappointment, though, to be honest, was the soundtrack: aside from being too loud, it really consists mostly of weird sounds/noises etc. While they do heighten the mood at times, or fit the atmosphere, they are not really not up to the lofty standards of the photography, the action, or the direction.

Also, the plot could have been a little tighter, and while the slow pace is what this movie needed, I'm not convinced it really had to be this long (or to touch on so many themes, as it does).

Still, it's a fantastic, and unique, viewing experience, and even with its imperfections it does create a believable (if gloomy and depressing) dystopian vision of the future, and touches on themes that could spark endless debate and reflection. And herein lies its beauty: shallow popcorn movies will have faded from everybody's memory in weeks. A movie like Blade Runner 2049 will inspire us and challenge us, whether we agree with some of its vision or not, maybe even whether we love it or hate it, for years to come.

1

I always gave the original Blade Runner 10/10. Seen it a over a 1000 times including at the movie theater. Good pace, visuals, music,

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

likable characters, bad guys. Yup, pretty much everything. One of my top 10 movies of all time. This review for 2049 is not because it should be the same thing or make it over the top.

OK now this Blade Runner 2049. Bad boring. Where nothing really means much. Unlikable characters, music is "meh" nothing unique(A poor version of the original_. Bad people in this, who cares? Bring us back with someone who is actually a threat(like Roy). We have some stupid terminator woman who really just flat out sucks. Poor casting. Jared Leto sucks. Yeah, he really does. Then you have the black guy with a cane from walking dead, who talks to everyone sideways. Who talks to people sideways? Why did you cast him? I've never see someone in any other movie, show or real life talk to people when they are not looking at them. Fail!!! I thought it was stupid in walking dead and now its really stupid. Plot is blah. Oh, it's also like a journey for Ryan Gosling to go from one Cameo to another with another boring scene. Not much vocab, emotion. Even Roy in the original had TONS of emotion and even had poetry at the end when he decided to turn a corner and save life instead of destroying everything in his path.

Harrison Ford is just an old man in this(sorry to say). Think it's time to retire. Did nothing in this film except hold a gun in Ryan's face and get captured with handcuffs.

Do not believe the hype, not a good movie.

6

What a disappointment, so much hype and, therefore, expectation but this is no more than a competent sci-fi film, certainly not a worthy successor to the original. I could support a 163 minute run time if there was plenty of content but at times it felt like the actors were moving and speaking slowly not for effect, but to fill in the gaps. As for the plot, everything revolved around the ability or otherwise of replicants to breed. If you have the technology to grow a human body from scratch and implant whatever memories you want I'd have thought introducing the mechanics of reproduction wouldn't be difficult. I could go on but really, this film isn't worth the bother.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

1

i cannot believe these ten star comments, first the visuals were mostly flat, there was no explanation why in this time there were virtually no people around, one scene only with about thirty extras, no lights seems to be on either in the shots were he is flying over the city. more importantly you had a very thin plot that could have been told in less than an hour. nothing happens for most of the film. it is as if all concerned were on valium. the music was just noise. talk about an anti-climatic ending, the film just whimpers out. none of the very little plot made any sense. so here we have yet again critics raving about nothing. an insult to the original in every way. do not waste

your time or money going to see this. i was going to list the many non-sensical things in the film but on reflection i don't think the film deserves anymore of my time

9

Similar responses to the original Bladerunner when it came out in 1982 (when feel-good hit ET was in theaters) and how people didn't know what to make of the then bleak, slow-paced Sci-Fi film. This is not unlike introducing Guardians of the Galaxy fans to 2049 today, an even darker, longer journey into the same Sci-Fi world. I can understand why some people might not like it, mostly due to attention spans and needing more explosions and violence with hyper-editing and a groovy soundtrack. This is not a knock on those movies, this is just a different genre. And just like the original, not everybody gets it or truly appreciates what has been accomplished here. This is a BIG movie, with a mystery that leaves you thinking and knowing that no matter what your first opinion is, a second viewing is required to even begin grasping everything you just saw. And not everybody wants to do that because they don't want to be challenged. They want the eye-candy action, a foot-tapping soundtrack and a vegetable soup ending spelled out for them (in 2 hours or less). So no, this movie is not for them.

However, if you're a fan of the original Bladerunner and that particular dystopian world, this movie takes it to another level. After seeing the original film, I remembering wondering what the world outside of the dark LA nights in 2019 would be like? And that is just one of the ways 2049 has expanded that notion, leaving an open door to an even bigger world with deeper questions beyond it. Yes it is a long and relatively slow paced movie (by design), and so was 'Once Upon a Time in the West'. And yet just like that movie as well as the original Bladerunner, over time, this too will get more and more appreciation with age (and wisdom) for those who truly appreciate the art of film-making. It's not perfect, no movie ever will ever to everybody will it? But it is an amazing achievement and I look forward to my next viewing with different eyes, taking in what I may have missed because there is so much to see and overlook.

3

Blade Runner is one of my favorite films of all time for a number of reasons:

1) Amazing groundbreaking trailblazing visuals that spawned an entire genre (aka 'cyberpunk').

2) Superb music by Vangelis that is integral to the film.

3) Great characters and amazing acting.

4) Underlying philosophical themes of corporate oppression (Blade Runner is just a small cog in a huge machine just carrying on with his life doing the job because otherwise he's reduced to nothing), existentialism (what it means to be human) coupled with Biblical

references presented in a subtle way.

5) Amazing practical special effects that make the world around the characters feel lived-in.

6) Meticulous attention to detail, lighting in particular.

While "2049" is nothing more than a mere attempt at recreating something in the style of the original by a studio committee ticking off the items in the checklist. The result is abysmal because it does not introduce something new in terms of visual design, interesting characters, music or story. On the contrary it tries so hard to tie itself to the original it's sickening. Call it fan-service or pandering, either way it leads to the movie being a highly derivative product that exists solely because of the original.

1) Plot lines that go against the premise of the original (Nexus 6 being able to reproduce, new Nexus 8 being easily distinguishable from humans) are stupid.

2) Acting is horrendous. Ana "Pouty lips" De Armas couldn't hold a candle to Sean Young not to mention the pretentious for pretentiousness sake Jared Leto. Ford is here for a paycheck and Gosling is deliberately one-note.

3) The music is a lame attempt at copying Vangelis' beautiful score.

4) Too varying visuals leave you with this feeling of an inconsistent world that doesn't follow the idea of polluted lifeless post-industrial world where the sun doesn't shine, it's constantly raining and the only light outside the building is that of the advertising that seems more real than anything else.

5) Running time. The original was purposefully slow while the overblown running time of the sequel comes off as director loving certain sets and trying to savor them far longer than he should've.

6) A myriad of logical mistakes and plot holes (kids with a 100% matching DNA are of different gender).

7) The opening shot with the closeup of an eye is almost beat for beat with the original.

8) The zooming sequence is hammered home by the sheer repetition.

9) The characters are bland, unoriginal and politically correct female copies of the originals, namely Madam and Luv.

10) The opening sequence is the unused part of the Fancher's script (watch Dangerous Days documentary).

Overall it seems that producers/writers have an erroneous idea of made the original film great. As if stuffing Biblical references into Neon-lit set pieces, inhabited by some pale copies of original characters and extending the awkward silences would amount to a great movie.

To sum up "Blade Runner 2049" does not reinvent the wheel, does not offer anything one-of-a-kind or even slightly memorable. There is no reason (other than cash flow for the studio execs) for it to exist. Save the cash and rewatch the original that actually challenges your intelligence and leaves you with a lot to think about.

There's a lot to like about this movie. Ryan Gosling gives a fantastic performance, both nuanced and surprisingly emotional. The action, when there is action, is well filmed and brutal and fun to watch. The CGI is pretty much flawless, and I'm not joking when I say that while watching this movie, you'll think you're watching a real world. The film is interesting, it's well shot, well directed, it's visually stunning, it's pretty, and the score is very thrilling. But as a whole, this movie is just so god da*n boring.

Look, I like slow paced movies, but this film is beyond slow paced.

It's brain dead. It's literally like watching a person with no arms and legs try to crawl across a football field. I won't lie, at first I liked this slow pace because it built up a lot of tension, a lot of mystery, a lot of suspense, and I assumed that eventually the film would kick into high gear; it never did. The pace remains constant throughout the entire run time of this movie. It's excruciatingly slow. The movie is almost 3 hours long, and it feels like 6. I couldn't wait for this movie to end, I mean by the end of the movie I expected to look in the mirror and see that I aged 65 years.

And also, the film is also overly convoluted. I'm not saying that this is a confusing film, because it's not; in fact, it's pretty straightforward and easy to follow. It just simply felt like this movie was convoluted for the sake of it being convoluted. At the time of watching everything felt important. I had to pee so badly the entire movie but I didn't want to get up because I felt like everything I was watching was super important. However, only after viewing do I realize that there were so many scenes that were totally unnecessary, that were there only to make the movie longer, more bloated, and more self-important.

Unfortunately, there's just not much else to say. This is a simple movie, and it gets a simple review. Look, I wanted to give this a high score, but I just couldn't, and I don't understand why other people are because this movie is simply not enjoyable or entertaining. Yes, it's well made, a feast for the eyes and ears, but that doesn't make it a good film; it makes it a well directed and produced film, but not a good one.

3

Let me describe the sequence of Blade Runner 2049 for you

Here goes:

Enter the cinema with an overpriced orange juice that is mandatory because in the last couple of years Hollywood has decided it is artsy and de rigueur to make films longer than 2 hours. The lights dim and commercials kick in for 10 minutes. A game for pre-teens wasting daddy's money on mobile phones and plans kicks in. 2 minutes of endorsements for GM trucks (with some guy whose tone is so macho I roll my eyes) follows. Then there is a reminder to get the right debit card to be hip and in. Then the film follows for a whopping 3 hours almost.

You

would think that there was a lot happening and we were kept excited. Alas, the only thing that kept me awake was the very periodical appearance of a beautiful eye candy whether real, hologram or laser show version that would keep things exciting.

If it were not for the sexy and lovable women Blade Runner 2049 was inane. Yes, inane. Apparently, not every film needs a sequel, a lesson Hollywood didn't learn from Hangover.

The script was so corny and the words so elementary one would be excused for thinking this is a practical joke. Head of police, yes head of police is told a big lie by a contractor, head of police believes it and all is good. No double checking, no verifying, no details asked no proof required. it is a matter of life and death for the order of the world and, of OK, let's keep rolling guys. The ending was also a joke. A vehicle is drowning and the hero is being drowned but in the last second kills the bad gal and swims back to the vehicle to mount a rescue (for the sequels that will follow). Replicants can have and make babies, but how? Oh well, watch the prequel Blade Runner Rogue Uno, which is coming out in 2020.

At that point all I wanted in life was to buy my own Joi and Luv and go back home.

1

In the ongoing tradition of Harrison Ford's Action heroes of the 1980's turning out to be really terrible dads, we have Blade Runner 2049, the sequel to 1982's Blade Runner.

We meet a replicant cop named K who is of a new variety that doesn't rebel unlike those bad ones in the movies. So he tracks down a Runaway Nexus 8, even though in the original movie, we were assured that Nexus 8's only had 4 year lifespans. During the course of this, they discover the bones of Sean Young's character from the original movie, along with the realization she had given birth.

Our hero also has a relationship with a Hologram Girl for some reason. I guess so he is sad when she gets deleted later in the movie.

If you are watching this movie to see Harrison Ford reprise his role as Deckard, you don't get to see him walking around like someone's confused grandpa until 2 hours into an interminably long movie. (Seriously, I feel bad for Ford. Why does he do this to himself?)

So they want to find the child of Deckard and Rachel because this is a replicant that can reproduce, which is supposedly more efficient than just growing them, for some reason. They say they need more replicants to colonize the outer colonies, but of course, there are plenty of people living in squalor, including a child labor sweatshop.

I can't emphasize enough how long, boring, uninteresting this movie was. It's like they watched the original and still had no idea what made it a good movie.

1

I didn't realise 2049 also was the actual length of the film! It sure felt like it! 3 hours of boring dialogue, hollow characters and an embarrassingly weak story. Hard to believe Ridley Scott really made this!

The first Blade Runner worked the pace of the film brilliantly up to the powerful ending. The story was a rather simple sci-fi noir detective story with a twist. It made some huge comments on humanity and what kind of future we want. It worked on so many levels. It could be viewed as a simple sci-fi detective story or as a great spiritual journey that asked all the big questions. And what can your maker do for you?

The first Blade Runner had so many great lines but with 2049 I cannot remember a single quotable line. 2049 completely lacks all which made the original the best sci-fi movie ever. I take the same view as Rutger Hauer recently did. Why even try to do a second one? It would be as painting a second Mona Lisa. Or building another Eiffel tower.

A huge disappointment of a sequel that should never have been made.

1

I have not seen such a badly made movie in a really long time. The only thing good about this movie is the actors. who did a good job in doing what they were told to. But the story is a pathetic layering of a typical family drama projected onto flying cars that is supposed to be our future. The jest of story, we industrialize ruthlessly to shred nature and then struggle to find a human emotion within ourselves and wage a war to hold on to it. Pathetic, heard many times, over and over. I am not sure if the theme was disguised as to give a facade of art or was so poorly directed that it was not even strongly projected. Either way, it gave me headaches. And the music was so grossly out of sync with the picture, it made no sense remotely. The unnecessary loud noises had not 1% context with what was happening on screen. Ridiculously long, out of context, poor direction, senseless sound effects, sorry picture of the story. sheer torture to sit through it.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

6

After seeing the the sequel to the amazing and amazing first Blade Runner, i am not disappointed. But i am not impressed either. In summary, 2049 plays it's cards too close to the chest, but without the element of surprise or good main characters to back it up. So lets break this movie down shall we?

Sound: 3/10 The sound is perfectly mixed.... and that's that. Otherwise it's like the new Doom soundtrack, just a bunch of bass rumbling around on top of old Vangelis lines(but probably without the vintage hardware). A few of the tracks are Psybient/Solar Fields like, which really fit into the scenes. But overall, its pretty uninspiring.

Visuals:

7/10 The sets are amazing, but there is definitely something off. The first movie had some sets that were really realistic, which is what i think made the movie believable. There was dirt, glass, patches of color, mats, live candles. It is the same as the visual difference between Alien/Aliens and Prometheus, if that makes any sense. It is obvious that they tried to replicate the set pieces of the original, but it comes off as way, way to grandiose and large-scale.

Pacing: 2/10 Horrible. Every scene is dragged out so long that you could walk out, cook some food and come back without missing a single important thing in the story. Sure, the first Blade Runner was slow, but it wasn't moving like a drugged sloth. To sum it up, they could have easily pushed the story into an hour long movie instead of three.

Story: 4/10 This is really where they dropped the ball. The characters are so boring they might as well be extras, especially Deckers girlfriend. I didn't care about her at the start, and i didn't care about her when she died. Also, the main villain. I mean, really? What were they thinking? She is so one-dimensional, she might as well be played by Brian Thompson. And no, making her cry while she kills things does not make her more complex and believable. The villain in the first Blade Runner, played by Rutger Hauer, at least had a glowing personality. Also, some scenes and ideas are just there for shock value. You will know which ones they are.

In summary: There is not one line or scene in the whole movie which is even close to the quality of the monologue at the end of the first movie.

5

As someone I know said, this is a "cargo cult movie". It has all the exterior of what a great Blade runner sequel would look like but there is little underneath.

Visuals are stunning, music and sound are good, camera work is as it should be, but when you get down to its core, there's little there. I am not usually the one to complain about a slow pacing or a plot that requires some suspense of belief, but here It seems they serve as a way to achieve the deep and philosophical feel without actually being either. Acting overall is mediocre at best, actors fail to convincingly relay emotion of the characters, that are themselves written quite shallow, unrelatable and one dimensional. There are some interesting questions raised by the plot, the whole thing is far from a total disaster, but nothing is explored deep enough or clearly enough to be truly interesting or engaging. That's why this movie is going to be remembered just as a sequel to it's famous original.

1

This movie was so bad I can't put into words. I loved Blade Runner but this sequel is so bad I can no longer watch the original.

Music over the top

Acting nonexistent Length, felt like 6 hours, and not in a good way

As people left the theater I saw shaking heads.

Don't understand people raving about it. They must be connected to the film somehow.

Save your money, watch the original and don't let this ruin it for you like it did for me

7

Being a hardcore Blade Runner and science fiction fanatic, I felt deeply compelled to write this review. I love Ridley Scott's original 1982 Sci-Fi classic. It is my all-time favorite movie. It had mystique and infused my imagination. It was a unique experience; hypnotic & surreal. The sequel, not so much!

My initial reaction of BR 2049 was that it's a gorgeous film. I was mesmerized by the striking cinematography and couldn't take my eyes off the screen. I will go as far saying that it's one of the most beautiful films I've ever seen. The rich visuals are so glaring it's hard to take it all in and grasp what you are seeing. From the opening shot you know you're in Blade Runner world. The overall look is instantly relatable to the first film and it's an amazing continuation in that regard. Also, the acting was excellent. The entire cast did a great job. However, once I settled into the film I realized that it is mainly a self-indulgent visual feast containing a weak story that lacks clarity & wisdom. There are obvious cliché moments and in certain aspects the story is comical and naive. The movie delves into complex philosophical themes and asks important questions but seldom explores them. It's all over the place. You get the sense that the film is not sure what it wants to be? It's clearly style over substance. Lots of homage is paid to the original through awesome images but the plot is paper-thin with a few subplots & twists added to make it seem intelligent. But is it? Well, not really! I think the movie tries too hard to be smart but fails to engage due to its long running time & fuzzy story/script, which may end up confusing and distancing the viewer.

BR 2049 has been most widely criticized for its length, and rightly so. It's overly long with some unnecessary scenes & dialogue whereas the first film was more subtle. BR1 was also slow-paced but in a different way. It had suspense and gradual progression to climax whereas BR2 is forced and even distracting at times. I love slow-paced films don't get me wrong! I can watch a film all day as long as it leads to a point and has tension. Certain films are deliberately made slow to establish a specific mood (e.g. Kubrick & Tarkovsky films). They draw you inside the film and make you feel like you're part of it. BR1 does this perfectly while the sequel is stretched out for the wrong reasons. It comes across as an excuse to showcase impressive visuals which is great if it moves the story along but not for the fun of it. BR1 had long takes and brief dialogue but it drove the story along smoothly and its

characters behaved realistically. There was a seamless flow to it. It's humorous how BR2 tried to mimic this technique from BR1 yet failed because its characters talk & move super slowly unlike real life.

Although it's a visually stunning film, I found it to be almost void of emotions and musicality. The characters were uninteresting and lacked emotional depth. In other words, I didn't care about them. I was not sure about any of the characters' motivations. In the first film, all the characters shined with charismatic personalities. They were unique in their own way and I truly cared about them. They embodied everything that makes us human. This was a vital element that made the original so special. BR2 on the other hand has sad and forgettable characters. It is a very sad film whereas the original had moments of happiness to mix up feelings and lighten the mood, which made it more realistic.

The music in BR 2049 was the biggest let down for me. It just didn't make sense because there was no music. A strange mix of very loud noises with faint echoes of original Vangelis tones interlaced (I listened to the entire score to be sure!). The musical score by Vangelis in the first film was one of the key elements that made the original my favorite film of all-time. I love atmospheric films that are visually & musically driven to tell the story. The music creates different feelings that make you fantasize. It makes you feel the movie and think about it long after it's over. The music in BR1 was incredible. It set the tone of the film perfectly. There was a haunting eerie atmosphere that along with the images created a hypnotic feel. Vangelis mostly used an electronic sound but he also incorporated piano & saxophone for melancholic effect. Not so in BR2. They messed up enormously this time. I know it's not possible to recreate Vangelis but they could have at least tried to create similarly-styled music by using the original score as a foundation. Even better, they could have perhaps made a completely original soundtrack all together. Blade Runner is an atmospheric film that is about feel and therefore must have a perfect music to visual ratio. Sure, they brought back one Vangelis theme for nostalgia but it wasn't enough.

To conclude, I enjoyed the film but unfortunately cannot say I loved it. I simply cannot fathom the enormous praise given by critics & moviegoers. I don't think they understood what made the first film brilliant. BR 2049 does contain the main elements required for a true Sci-Fi film but fell flat at further exploring its themes. The original film on the other hand is a masterpiece. It felt spiritual & spellbinding whilst the sequel did not. Should you go see it? Yes. I would still recommend fans and anyone curious to go see this film in theaters despite its evident flaws. But as a huge fan it left me disappointed. Maybe I had high expectations!

I gave it a generous 7/10

which Scott Ridley fought against are here. Ridley has become the studio system.

Blade Runner 2049, likely the least desired sequel in history, is making Philip K Dick roll in his grave. What is the point of this almost three hour-long sequel? Of course, it is to continue the film industry's addiction to sequels and make cash. That is it.

Let me get this straight: the world is devastated and anyone who is anybody moves off-world, but people are living in spacious luxury in a casino drinking fine aged Scotch? There is beautiful white snow falling from the skies and sexy call girls approach you on the street? This world is for schmucks, but the main character has an artificial girlfriend with legs to die for waiting at home for him making dinner and giving him threesome sex? Someone book me a ticket back from off-world to Earth please!

This was the kind of logical misstep that Ridley fought against when the studio released BR to cinemas with a gorgeous drive through the countryside at the end of the original. It makes no sense.

Face it, this is the film that should not exist and by watching all these 'franchise' films we feed the stupidity of Hollywood.

BR2049 is the same as the last 10 marvel films, the next ten Star Wars films and the Ghostbusters sequel, but is prettier and more visual.

3

"Blade Runner 2049" comes off incredibly long and boring. Not because of the slow pacing – "Blade Runner" had slow pacing too, but had the viewer hypnotized – but because there's no interesting thoughts present and nothing new really. Thematically the movie is exploring the same questions (about being human etc.) as the first movie did 35 years ago. And the few 'new' additions to the Blade Runner universe are totally devoid of originality. Take for instance K's hologram-wife. Not only are those scenes totally unnecessary (that three-way scene, jeez!), but we've seen the concept so many times before (for instance in Spike Jonze's "Her").

Apart from that, the movie is riddled with plot holes and stuff that just don't make very much sense. Tyrell get's killed off by a replicant and his Nexus-7 prototype runs off, shortly after Tyrell Corp rushes a line of replicants with OPEN ENDED lifespans and no other safety device than implanted memories (that didn't work with Rachael). No. Just no.

Furthermore we are told the nexus 9 are programmed to obey. However K lies to his superiors, constantly acts on his own, acts emotionally from early on in the movie. He does not obey at all.

And the revelation of a replicant child being born has people talking about revolution. Robin Wrights Joshi says it will 'break the world'. But how? Rachael was the only replicant able to give birth and Tyrell took that secret with him. Neither the few remaining Nexus 8's or the 9's can give birth – so no, it doesn't break the world. It doesn't

break anything. But the movie really wants us to take this very seriously (Hans Zimmer is doing his loudest to make us sit in awe).

And it gets even worse. Later we learn that Jared Leto's ridiculous bad guy Wallace (those monologues!) strives to learn the secret of making replicant babies. But why? That undermines the entire idea of replicants. Tailormade slaves with superhuman ability; strength, intelligence etc. that are controlled by implanted memories. Having replicants make babies the old way would offer zero control of the outcome and the child replicants would have to grow up, go to school, make their own memories. What's the point then? And what's the difference, from just having some people make babies?

A lot of people has called Blade Runner 2049; intellectual sci-fi; and so forth, but I found it to be quite the contrary. The movie forcefully demands you to accept it as highly intelligent art, but if you scratch the surface, you'll find something very different.

7

Beautiful and empty Bladerunner 2049 is the needless squeal to the 1980s classic.

Set 30+ years after the events of the first film we meet Ryan Gosling continuing in the Bladerunner tradition of shooting robots. Along the way, he discovers a great secret that might change the social order of a world that is made up of humans and they're purpose built slaves.

All of that was covered in the first 20 minutes of the film by the way. Skip ahead to the 3rd act, grumpy Harrison Ford shows up and, well, that's about it.

Leaving the theatre my wife and I tried to decide just why Bladerunner left us both feeling so indifferent to it's existence. She had never seen the first film, I had, but our feelings were the same. Bladerunner is great to look at and I appreciated the nods to the original, but, it became quickly apparent our apathy stemmed from the fact nothing much happens in this movie.

Office K's (Gosling) investigation into a missing person moves at snails pace and none of the people we meet along the way are as interesting as the scenery around them. One example is Wallace (Jared Leto) the new Tyrell and the main villain of the film. His speeches are dull and only go to serve the plot, he leaves all of his serious evilness to his sidekick while he stays home sporting a handicap which must be a desired physical affectation considering how easily it could be treated in his time.

The main theme in both Bladerunner movies is one day the slaves will cast off their chains and be free. Sure, there's stuff about love and self-awareness but these are side issues that have been explored elsewhere to better effect. The main focus of 2049 is humanity needs an indentured underclass to do its heavy lifting and either you are for it or against it and that is a pretty thin premise for a movie this long.

Late in the film Officer K sits on a deck chair staring out over an

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

irradiated city. He looks like a man lost, not knowing where to go next. This moment is the perfect metaphor for Bladerunner 2049. All of it's surprises are revealed too early on leaving both the audience and characters to mull over the same obvious of choices for the rest of the movie.

A wasted opportunity.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
8

I love the book so I was really excited to see this, and I have to say I was not disappointed. The acting was brilliant and the film very well made. Aside from a few changes it mostly follows the book quite closely which I was pleased about and the end was especially well done. I have to confess that I haven't actually got round to seeing any of the other adaptations of the book yet but I certainly enjoyed this one.

9

I haven't seen the 1974 version so this movie easily stands out in all aspects to me, whether it was the camera view or the cast ensemble. While reviewing, people often forget the issue with the original story i.e. it's set entirely in the train. Considering the limited space that they had, Branagh does an amazing job with the direction. This isn't just a remake but in fact an entirely different adaptation. Not that it runs away from the main story but it has a sort of different take on it. Apart from that, Branagh easily manages to portray Poirot with all his eccentricity. (The accent was the pull factor for me). Josh Gad does an amazing job with Hector McQueen. Judi Dench shines as Princess Dragomiroff along with Pfeiffer as Mrs. Hubbard. The only bummer was the fact that it leaves you wanting for more.

8

I was a bit skeptical about this movie, but I must say I was pleasantly surprised. Of course, it's not perfect, and sometimes Branagh overdo it a little, but whoever likes the genre will be captured by the fantastic atmosphere and will not be bored, because Branagh has been able to put some pepper on the story. His Poirot convinced me and the old glories like Judy Dench, Wilhelm Defoe and Johnny Depp do their job and do it well, but in my opinion the most interesting notes come from the young people: I personally loved Josh Gad and Daisy Ridley, but the real surprise was Sergei Polunin: I mean, for those who saw him performing as dancer, it's not a real surprise, but it's really hard to believe it was his first time in a movie! He has given to his character this melancholy, turbulent and passionate aura, halfway between a Shakespearean prince and James Dean. His expressions, his little gestures, the way he looked at his wife, he made me feel like a

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

teenager who cannot wait to buy his poster and stick it over her bed!
And let me say, that guy definitely knows how to "handle" a woman as well as he can deliver a kick! As usual, more the critics hate a film, more it worth to be seen.

7

I went to see Murder on the Orient Express last night and this is my review. I am rating it 7/10

A quick overview of the film is that someone is murdered on the Orient and the worlds best detective played brilliantly by Kenneth Branagh must solve this case with caution and intelligence.

The film starts smoothly with some laughs produced by Kenneth. We meet every character before the train journey and that's when the guessing begins.

I really enjoy a film that keeps you guessing and gives you a few unexpected twists. The orient certainly delivers that.

Pros: Few well timed laughs, Kenneth Branagh is fantastic, Guessing Twists, Being focused on what is going on Lovely scenery, Great cast and an intense story.

Cons: To be honest, with the type of film it is and plot. There isn't anything bad I can say about it because it delivered Agatha Christie's story very well.

An entertaining watch for those who like a mystery film with a strong cast and to be engaged throughout but getting you to guess at most stages of the film.

I guessed loads but was wrong!

Thank you and hope you enjoy this review

10

We always do the same mistake when a movie is made following a best selling novel is that we compare the novel and the movie. But we must keep in mind that novel is always superior than movies in many aspect. So my earnest request to the audience please don't compare it with the novel. When you compare you will loose the momentum of the movie. Because it is an excellent movie...A pure crime thriller of pre modern era. It has suspense as well as buried past mystery of all the passenger's life. This made the detective process more complicated.

The movie has many aspects to cheer about. It has a good portrait of some 18 th century look with all those etiquettes and manners. The movie is fully loaded with the part part story of different suspects that made it difficult for the audience to guess the final answer.

As you know most central roles were done by excellent actors and actresses there is no complaint about the acting. All the acting was very much splendid. Only it can be said that they have done it a little heavy. The dialogues are sometimes a bit too much for the audiences to capture.

Over all the movie is a little slow..Like the thriller movies of early 1960's or 70's . But it has many good things to offer. A group of

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

excellent actors together with a fine plot and diffuse suspense has made it a good enjoyable movie. But as i said it is a bit slow and dialogue dependent movie some viewers may experience it as a boring time. i have to say you had better show some patience and you will find the gold. This is A movie that can shake you when you will watch it even for the second time..Imagine what will happen when you go for the first time??????

10

Kenneth Branagh does it again. For many years the sniffy set of Guardian-types would turn up their Metropolitan noses at Agatha Christie. Her writing was, evidently, not high-brow, she churned out too many and (horror of horrors) she wrote airport thrillers.

But Christie understood human nature in its myriad forms and she wrote accordingly: at times with brilliance.

It is this which Kenneth Branagh so fabulously unveils in his Murder on the Orient Express. Yes, he has assembled a world class cast of superstar actors, but it's Branagh himself, both as actor and Director, who pulls the real meaning of this story out.

This is a tale of loss, sorry, unrequited grief and, above all, revenge. You don't get much more powerful emotions in human existence and these are wonderfully executed here.

It's fantastic, even if you know the plot. Go and see it and watch this wonderful tale again from a different perspective. Don't go just for light-hearted entertainment. It is that on one level. But it's also a tale which plumbs the depths of human existence: what Poirot calls 'the poison of deep grief.'

Fabulous film.

4

My wife and I looked so forward to seeing this movie. Unfortunately it was boring. No drama, no suspense. The cinematography was excellent. we actually saw people leave the cinema before the end of the movie. The star studded cast really don't shine. Very much a Sunday evening TV viewing movie.

8

Fill a train with a most impressive cast line up, throw in a grisly murder mystery and have the mighty impressive Kenneth Branagh go on a quest to find out who done it and you got yourself a delightful little movie which will most certainly entertrain.

A take on Agatha Christie's popular novel Murder on the Orient Express, the story follows that of detective Hercule Poirot, who is called on business to London, and so takes the last available room on the Orient Express. Though wanting nothing more than to relax and enjoy his journey, he inadvertently finds himself working, when one of the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

passengers is mysteriously killed.

It's a wonderful simple story which sees detective Poirot go from guest to guest questioning them on their whereabouts on that fateful night. The opening scene did worry me somewhat with it's overly smart-arsed series of events, akin to that of a last few SHERLOCK TV episodes. It risked going off the rails and being too clever, well beyond believable, but thankfully for the main mystery it calms itself down.

The 1h 54min runtime steams by as I sat and enjoyed first class performances from all the cast. Stand out characters were Daisy Ridley's Miss Mary Debenham, Josh Gad's Hector MacQueen, Leslie Odom Jr.'s Dr. Arbuthnot and of course the brilliant Kenneth Branagh as the brilliantly quirky and intelligent Hercule Poirot. Only Michelle Pfeiffer's performance lacked somewhat and took away from what could have been a much more emotional scene towards the end.

For a story that takes place almost entirely on a train, the director uses the limited space well, for as this narrative unfolds, it doesn't feel too claustrophobic, even in the narrow hallways and the tight compact cabins. Shifting the camera into creative perspectives at times helps keep the scenes fresh and visually stimulating (I especially enjoyed the birds eye view of the murder scene). The pacing is snappy and energetic and at no point feels like its running out of steam. Kenneth Branagh should also be commended for the way he juggles a story consisting of such a myriad of actors, by giving each character their own perspectives and motives, helps to keep the viewer on their toes; questioning every nuance and detail and while some are barely given any screen time, most feel substantially explored.

Overall Murder on the Orient Express conducts itself well, an interesting "who done it?" mystery that will keep you guessing throughout. Wonderfully paced and fantastically performed. After something a bit different from your usual sci-fi/superhero adventure then this is just the ticket!

You can find more reviews like this over on my website:
www.popcornography.co.uk

1

DO NOT waste your money on this film. The script is bland, the CGI terrible, the acting bland and the directing a tour de force of Brannagh's egomania. Even his French accent was rubbish. I cannot believe how films like this ever get the money to get made. It was about as suspenseful as unleavened bread and deserves to simply be forgotten.

1

Worst film I have seen in my life 95% of it is just bullshit talking...

Few errors in the movie, waste of money.

I was expecting more out of it... than just pure talk.

Johnny Depp should of have played a better role than

15min...

Two other people that watched this film have left the cinema... that just shows how boring it can get.

6

There's some outstanding points in this film namely

1) Kenneth Branagh - his portrayal of the world's greatest Belgian detective is the best I've seen by far

2) Cinematography- exceptional alpine backdrops . Hand-held camera-work was exceptional

3) Casting - superb all star cast

But then there's the points that weren't so good

Some of script / delivery of lines was unintelligible

Some of the CGI was brilliant but some was quite poor and at one point the train looked like a child's toy! Also it felt a bit like the Polar express at times and that's over twelve years old !

Overall the film just could have been so much better it had all the ingredients , setting , cast , story but it failed to deliver a top notch performance. Shame really as I really looked forward to this and grudgingly paid the extra £4 for a reclining chair !

It sets itself up for DEATH ON THE NILE - I just hope that's a better rendition .

Pad.A 6.5/10

5

Good: The amazing all-star cast of academy award winners. Even though each actor/actress plays their role well, no one was a standout. The setting of most of the movie is the Orient Express, which helps contribute to a trapped and isolated feel and makes you feel as if you were there with the detective. The introductory to Hercule Poirot is great, but as the movie chugs along;

Bad: Overall, the movie lacks comedy and heartfelt moments. At times, the accent of Poirot is hard to understand, which leads to clues that are not clearly understood and a story that is hard to follow along. The movie is more of an interrogation of each character, by just going down the huge list of suspects and giving each character equal screen time. It progresses at a slow pace and the clues never lean me towards one person or another. I also did not find the murder to be inventive or creative.

Overall: Even with an outstanding cast, the movie suffers from a generic plot. The movie lacks the engaging aspects of a crime movie and relies too heavily on its cast to deliver its moments.

2.7/5

1

This is what happens when you give the Force Awakens raving reviews, you ruin cinema. Almost none of this endearing, the ensemble cast is not used well at all and perhaps not even considered much of a force save Brannagh. Johnny Depp is simply not good, Daisy Ridley is even

worse. Terrible waste of time.

[illegible]

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
10

What a movie and what great acting. Frances McDormand has done amazing job and deserves awards for playing Mildred Hayes. Although a very serious subject, this movie is a comedy.

The punch lines are to the point and absolutely hilarious. I went to the Toronto International Film Festival to watch this movie and boy, do I consider myself lucky to have decided to watch it.

The story, screenplay, direction are amazing. After The Grand Budapest Hotel, this movie comes as a breath of fresh air.

9

Having recently won the People's Choice Awards at TIFF, Three Billboards outside Ebbing, Missouri is very easy to see why it won.

Three Billboards is a dark but also funny and heart-felt story about one woman's quest to get justice for her daughter's rape and murder. After Mildred Haynes buys three billboards with words written on them accusing the town's well-liked sheriff of having not found her daughter's killer, it sets a series of events that turns the citizens and the cops against her.

The thing I can say about Three Billboards without going into spoilers is that it is wildly unpredictable. One moment you think things are going one direction as expected then it takes hard left turn that only adds to the dynamic between the characters. As the pressure within the town builds and anger is pointed towards Mildred, we see many of these characters evolve in order to deal with tragedy and grief and learn to find peace. And the movie goes through a roller-coaster of emotions. One moment you are laughing your butt off from the hilarious dialogue then you feel like someone just punched you in the gut. With every victory you think this story brings you feel like it was taken away from because of the world's unfairness and injustice. In lesser hands the mixture of dark and comedic tones would not work, but director and writer Martin McDonagh knows how to balance them to perfection.

The performances here just through the roof. Frances McDormand delivers

a performance that will for sure get her into the Lead Actress awards race at the Oscars. As Mildred, McDormand just cuts loose with her performance with every line of hate, cynicism and cursing towards everyone she feels doesn't truly understand the internal pain she is going through. But McDormand does now and then show a soft side to Mildred. It shows that Mildred is just person like everyone who has her own way of dealing with the tragedy of losing her own child. And Sam Rockwell also gives one of the best performances of his career as the flawed and very misguided cop Dixon. The character of Dixon is short-tempered, volatile, and not bright with some baggage of his own that the locals accuse him of. But Sam Rockwell brings his charm and sincerity to what could be a rather unlikable character. And in the latter half, you see Dixon go through a tremendous arc of learning to care about others rather than just being angry towards them. Other great performances that should be called out are Woody Harrelson, Peter Dinklage, John Hawk and Caleb Landry Jones.

Three Billboards outside Ebbing, Missouri is easily one of the best movies this year and is worth seeing once it comes out in wide releases.

9

I watched this movie during the 2017 Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF) after it had won the Grolsch People's Choice Award. I already had high hopes for this movie and it definitely did not disappoint! Concept of the movie seems pretty easy to understand: Mildred Hayes (played by Frances McDormand) is still grieving the loss of her murdered daughter and challenges the local sheriff's (Woody Harrelson) inability to find her killer. From watching the trailer I was a little unsure if this was going to be a drama or a comedy, but turns out it was both, or more accurately a dark comedy. The first few minutes of the movie really set the tone for keeping you interested in the dramatic core, maintaining the humour in events as they unfold. Not only are the characters perfectly cast individually (example my fav Sam Rockwell as Officer Jason Dixon), but the writing of the entire script makes it so easy to enjoy this entire movie.

Writer/Director Martin McDonagh deserves a high five for this accomplishment!

9

It seemed that the pregnant police detective Marge Gunderson from
Fargo
 would forever be the most memorable character of Frances McDormand's acting career. But now I'm not so sure. Mildred Hayes, the heroine from
Three Billboards
, is a serious contender. This might well be her best performance ever.

The part of Mildred Hayes was written with McDormand in mind. Hayes is a divorced single mother, living with her son on the outskirts of a

small, remote town. She had a daughter too, but the girl was raped and killed on a quiet mountain road not far from home. Frustrated by the lack of progress of the investigation, Hayes decides to rent three dilapidated billboards, publicly accusing the local police chief of incompetence. By doing so, she attracts the attention of the media, angers almost the entire town and causes a succession of increasingly violent actions.

Although the film is about grief, anger, revenge and violence, it is extremely funny. Above all because of Hayes's stubborn character and her ability to verbally humiliate people by her extremely sharp tongue. The monologue she delivers when a priest visits her house to tell her she has gone too far, is priceless.

Apart from McDormand's performance, the screenplay is another great feature of this film. The story is full of unexpected twists, gradually shifting the positions of the main characters towards each other. None of the characters are one-dimensional: they all reveal surprising parts of their personalities as the story moves forward.

And then there is the overall, almost Coen-esque atmosphere of a small town full of colourful characters. There is a racist cop, a friendly midget, a smart advertising guy and a pretty girl who is so dumb she doesn't know the difference between polo and polio.

It is hard to mention something negative about this film.

Three Billboards's is, from start to finish, a great movie. I can't imagine anyone not enjoying it.

10

I tried to write the summary of this movie for three days and still i have not found the correct words to connect them in order to make a sentence capable of expressing the quality of it. I have written the summary many times and i have erased in every occasion. So i decided to show some dots in the summary. That is the symbol of how excellent the movie is.

The plot :

The plot is very much uncommon. it has so many facts that it offers you a guessing 2 hour while you goes through the movie. It provides enough backbone to the rest of the element of the movie. It creates a concrete base upon which the movie stands firmly.

The mystery :

As the movie deals with a murder it contains enough mystery to shake the audiences. Scene after scene all this unpacked. But they have to wait till the end to solve the puzzles.

The resistance :

The movie is about the resistance of a mother. It starts with the desperate mission of a mother to bring the killers of her daughter to light. Those billboards, the sudden attacks, burgaining against the local authority.. all these are the part of a resistant mother which is also the part and parcel of the movie.

Acting :

Acting in my view is up to the mark. Frances McDormand is exquisite in her role as a mother seeking justice. Others have also come to the party.

Direction :

This is the characterstics of the movie i was most

impressed with.

Although the plot and the acting is out of question but it is the director who has the sole credit to connect all this. He has slowly but cleverly unfolded all the sector available. He is good enough to make the movie what it looks like in the projector. He has turned the raw materials to a mature masterpiece.

Questions and answers :

last of all the main event is the answers of the question that were aroused during the first session of the movie. You have to wait to find the answers. This waiting makes it more attractive.

So clearly it is a movie of great quality..a bit older type..but you know old is gold..

9

Outstanding work by writer/director Martin McDonagh, in a return to form after the off-kilter "Seven Psychopaths." This film about the joint cul-de-sacs of loss and revenge. It is both horrifying and touching, and it is also very funny.

McDonagh, a first-rate playwright, knows how to structure scenes and write dialogue. To do him justice, first-rate actors are required. They must love the succulent stew of characters he cooks up, because he catches the very best.

I can't find enough superlatives for Frances McDormand and Sam Rockwell. They are, here as in everything they've ever been in, great. They are ably supported by Woody Harrelson, Caleb Landry Jones, Clarke Peters, Sandy Martin, Lucas Hedges, John Hawkes, Amanda Warren. The only weak link in this superb ensemble is Abbie Cornish, who is warm and smiley but is unfortunately out of her depth: a very odd piece of casting.

Cinematography, production design, costume, editing, music - they're all top of the range. But in the end it's down to McDormand and Rockwell, and the brilliant script.

8

I was almost afraid from watching the trailer that this would be one of those overwhelming movies because it involved dark and serious subject matter. I was pleasantly surprised that it was actually enjoyable because of the way it dealt with all the serious subjects. The script mixed just the right about of comedic relief (no, it isn't a comedy though there are some laugh out loud moments) with a compelling story. Each and every actor's performance was spot on for their character which helped make it well worth seeing!

10

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is a dark comedy that has an a-list cast with names like Frances McDormand, Woody Harrelson, Sam

Rockwell, John Hawkes, and Peter Dinklage. It centers around Mildred Hayes, a woman whose daughter was raped and killed, and who believes that the local police have not done enough about it. In reaction, she erects three billboards outside of her town that send a message to the sheriff about the state of the investigation.

Writer/director Martin McDonagh (Seven Psychopaths, In Bruges) has outdone himself with this one. In my opinion, if this isn't one of the top Oscar contenders come awards season, then Hollywood has officially lost its mind.

Basically everything about this film works: from the acting, to the writing, to the direction. McDormand gives the performance of her career here, giving us humor through all the pain clearly shown on her face. Rockwell also gives his best performance here as a cop who isn't that bright and is more than a little racist.

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is probably the most unpredictable film of the year, and that's coming from a year that includes films like Baby Driver and Logan. There are scenes where you think that you know where the plot is going, but then midway through it completely flips the script.

For the entire run-time of this film, I was invested. It has the perfect run-time; it ends exactly when it needs to and there is not a scene that feels out of place.

It seems like one of the hardest things to do in film nowadays is to balance comedy and drama. However, this movie does it effortlessly. Each scene has just the right amount of comedy and drama, and sometimes, despite the fact that you're laughing, it's easy to forget that jokes are being made.

Also, the message that this film gives off resonates very powerfully with you after the film finishes. It makes you see the good side in humanity, despite our flaws. No character in this film is a cliché; one-dimensional shell of a person. Everybody has a reason for being there, which is more than some films recently have offered.

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is easily one of the best and most enjoyable films of 2017, and it will make you laugh, cry, and think all in one sitting. There are not any clear flaws with this film that I can find, but I am still searching.

I give Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri an A+.

10

It goes without saying that dark comedy is very difficult to accomplish. I would almost say it's harder to pull off than regular comedy because you need to be able to keep people invested in the dramatic aspect of the film, while still keeping them laughing throughout the majority of the duration. Director Martin McDonagh has matured as a filmmaker over the years, starting off with In Bruges, which was pretty much a flat-out comedy, to Seven Psychopaths, which placed him a little further into the spotlight, but I must admit that

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is not only his best film to date, but also one of the best films I've received the pleasure of witnessing all year. From laughter to genuine tension and heart, this is a film that's pretty much perfect all around. Here is why I can recommend this film to everyone.

After the tragic death of her daughter, Mildred Hayes calls out the

local authorities on three billboards, publicly stating that they're not doing their jobs and not a single arrest has happened since the death of her daughter. While publicly displaying this is upsetting to some, she sees it as a point being made. Through some very cleverly written humor throughout the entire film, levity is brought to the table in times of sorrow, making this a very easy movie to watch.

Although the story itself is quite depressing, this film is written in a way that will still find a way to make you smile.

From the very first few frames of this film, you can tell the tone will

be handled perfectly. Written and directed by Martin McDonagh with pure class, you can tell that he was very passionate when bringing this film to fruition. Every line of dialogue either progressed the story along, developed a character, made the audience laugh, or provided deep insight into the event of the murder itself. While not having the bearings of a conventional murder mystery, many viewers may not like the way this film concludes, but in the context of the movie as a whole and everything it's setting out to accomplish, it really does have a realistic and true finale.

It's arguable that some of the law enforcement officers play just as

significant a role as Mildred does throughout the film, being pretty much present every time a revelation occurs, but I gravitated the most towards Officer Dixon. I've always been a huge fan of Sam Rockwell, and his character here is one of the most essential to this story, set on being there from beginning to end, trying his absolute best to be of any help. While Woody Harrelson's portrayal of Chief Willoughby is by far the most important to the story at hand, it's the characters around him that drive him to his actions throughout the course of the movie. The characters are truly what make this film as likable as it is, and they're all wonderfully drawn.

Overall, when looking back on my experience watching Three Billboards

Outside Ebbing, Missouri, I find myself not being able to wait until its official theatrical release to watch it again. I found this film to be stellar in every sense of the word. From a noteworthy performance by Francis McDormand, devoted secondary performances, a screenplay that will have you consistently laughing, while also being emotionally involved with the serious storyline at hand, and pulling the audience in with its subtly composed score, everything about this film is worth praise. This was a huge surprise for me and I can't recommend you checking it out enough. Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is a fantastic piece of modern cinema.

Seen at the Viennale 2017: writing reviews about several movies in the last year, I nearly have to pass on this one. Three Billboards is of such high quality that it is nearly impossible to comment on it. Only highly professional reviewers should dare to write something about such high quality script, directing and cast. Why not ten stars, then? We still have to see, whether this one will become a classic movie for the Top 200. Maybe, it will. For sure it earns such a high rating. Three Billboards touches soul and heart from 10 minutes after the beginning up to the end. Seldom I changed from laughing to sadness in such a high frequency. But the movies greatest strength is: it gives hope. Hope in the possibility that people can change from the worse to the better. People are changing in this movie. People can change in real life. We get remembered that this is possible. For sure, I will never forget the highly emotional moment, when Dixon risks his life by grabbing the burning crime file of Hayes and jumps through the fire wall. This movie deserves every single Oscar it will (hopefully) get.

9

I won't even try and sum up all my feelings about this movie because no matter what I'd write, it wouldn't do it justice.

What I'll say is that it's brilliant, it's dark, it's hilarious - and not in a slapstick-funny-kind of way but in an authentic and real funny kind of way - and it transitions so effortlessly between that hilarity and despair that I was captivated throughout the entire film.

McDormand shines. Rockwell shines. Harrelson shines.

Everyone shines.

So far, for me, this has best screenplay, best actress in a leading roll and maybe even best actor in a supporting roll written all over it.

Every film lover is gonna talk about this gem in a couple of weeks/months and I'm sure that every film lover is gonna absolutely love this film.

Thank you, Martin McDonagh!

(9.1/10)

7

In the words of poet Harivansh Rai Bachchan, the beauty of film is "You get poetic justice in less than 3 hours. You often don't get poetic justice in a lifetime." If that'd be the case than the collective works of Martin McDonagh serves as a counterweight to such thinking. His films, often involve looking in vain for the nebulous concepts of love, justice and meaning in a post-modern world. His characters, likable if deeply flawed, shout into the void but never find the answers they seek.

Thus it's hard to truly gage a film like Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri. Much like In Bruges (2008) and Seven Psychopaths (2012), this film is rich with wit yet syncopated in its own world of messy loops, twists, turns and tones. The story begins with the melodies of Renee Fleming's "Tis the Last Rose of Summer"; but then ends

the first five minutes on the screen in capital letters. The letters spell out "RAPED WHILE DYING," "STILL NO ARRESTS?" "HOW COME, CHIEF

WILLOUGHBY". So starts the saga of the Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri, sanctioned by a grieving mother; printed for a dying man. The mother in this case is Mildred Hayes (McDormand), who much like her billboards stands unwavering. She's hassled by everyone from Sheriff Willoughby's (Harrelson) clueless deputies to her ex-husband Charlie (Hawkes). Still, even when her son Robbie (Hedges) is incensed to give her the silent treatment, Mildred demands her message be heard. Her teenage daughter was raped and murdered seven long months ago and nothing has been done. She wants justice. Yet the funny thing about justice in this movie is the moment you get a

good handle on the concept, the film bleeds it away like water from outstretched hands. So too do the characters. Every time you get a firm understanding of who they are, something logical yet wholly unexpected forces you to assess and reassess. No one else best exemplifies this than Sam Rockwell's Office Dixon who goes from a racist Barney Fife to a numbed Travis Bickle with nary a dropped beat to make you question the change. The ensemble carries the film through a lot of ugliness with grace. We

glide uncomfortably close along the sharpened edges of rape, murder, abuse, suicide, alcoholism and racism. All the while questions like: "is it okay to be angry in an unfair world?" and "how do our decisions

affect others?" smear into the ashy black comedy and imposing melodrama. Deep care was given to breathe life into these characters. Even when someone as non-consequential as Charlie's nineteen-year-old girlfriend (Weaving) enters the fray you can't help but admire how these people interact and curious about how they must feel. Martin McDonagh more than ever invites comparisons to the Coen brothers

in this film. A signal that to me at least proves McDonagh is ambitious, but out of his weight class at this point in his career. For while the Coen's approach their films with the same character-first, free-form narratives, there's always a level of benevolence behind the cynicism. Here, instead of smirk-worthy amusement there is anger.

Instead of cosmic curiosity there is more anger. Instead of wonder, there's just more anger, and you know what they say about anger; it just begets more anger. If anger were the spice of life, then this murky soup would definitely

be worth consuming. But as it is not, regular filmgoers should approach this witty, richly rendered film with extreme caution. McDonagh's oeuvre is an acquired taste and those liable to agree with Bachchan's approach to film may walk out severely shook. But for those fixing for an overall decent barnstorming black comedy, the "Show Me" state might just have something for you.

This movie first drew me in because it was an R Rated Black Comedy. As I have been on the lookout for them since watching the Voices, I happily settled to watch this movie. And it was a good thing I did. Firstly, the director, Martin McDonagh, is one of the best I've known, and he did not let me down with this film. He managed to display what he does best, creating a funny movie with a dark backstory. This was as heart moving as it was heart-wrenching. If you needed an example of an oxymoron, this would be the one. Funny and depressing, it tugs at your heartstrings whilst keeping you on a journey of laughter.

The cast, perfect. Being honest, I hadn't heard of Frances McDormand before. But after this film, I will never forget her. An amazing choice of the dead daughter mother figure, she's stubborn and great. Will be seeing more of her work in time to come. Woody Harrelson and Sam Rockwell have great on-screen chemistry. Unlike McDormand, I am a huge fan of Rockwell, loved his work in the Green Mile and Confessions of a Dangerous Mind and if you aren't a fan of him for whatever reason before this film, you will surely be one after. I'm surprised he managed to sneak in a few dance moves as well, he really stole the show.

So, if you are looking for something to brighten your day, I cannot recommend this enough. As I have said, one of the best dark comedies of our time. Please, watch it, you will not be let down.

6

So far, this film has an IMDb rating of 8.3...and this is extraordinarily high. But the film has been in festivals and I am sure the rating will change some when the film is in general release. As for me, I think it's incredibly overrated.

The story is about an angry mom, Mildred (Frances McDormand). Her daughter was brutally murdered and raped...and the police haven't been able to do anything with the case. So, in desperation and anger, she rents out three billboards and calls the local Police Chief (Woody Harrelson) to task for this. Surprisingly, most of the town comes down against Mildred...who was just exercising her First Amendment rights. What happens from there...well, just see the film.

There were many wonderful scenes and characters in this picture. But, there were also many main characters who were just god-awful and unlikable...including Mildred! In fact, later in the film when she thinks the police department has wronged her, she burns down the building and accidentally flames one of the cops! So, no one who is a main character in the film is nice or likable...making this movie a bit of a hard-sell. Too much cussing (even by 2017 standards), very crude language and overall nastiness prevent this one from being a must- see film.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

7

First off. Some people are calling this a horror movie. It is not. This is a mysterious drama-thriller with supernatural elements, and just the slightest hint of horror. Now, I expected this so it was OK, but be aware. Expectations is a movie worst enemy!

OK! So Thelma is beautifully shot. Thought has gone into each scene, and each camera angle. The movie overall is very calm, kinda quiet. Eili Harboe is excellent as the titular character. The other characters are good too, but she stands out. She has a very natural way of acting. Also she is beautiful, and so is Kaya Wilkins, which plays her new friend. Gorgeous people.

Like I said, Thelma is a calm, low key movie for the most part. I did think it dragged just a tad in the middle part, but both the beginning and ending is pretty good. It has certain romantic tendencies, but it was done in a not annoying way. Good.

There are some scenes with CGI here, and they are very well done. You almost won't notice they are CG, except from the fact that you know you are watching something impossible. That's good. Thelma is not heavy on big effect stuff, but the effects that are, are excellent.

Joachim Trier is Norwegian movie critics golden child. They love him over here. Personally I'm no big fan, but then again, Reprise is the only movie of his I've seen, so I can't really say. But Thelma is the kind of supernatural movie movie critics are actually allowed to like. Because it's kinda artsy, ya'll! ;) Anyway, I liked it, didn't love it, but maybe I will later? I doubt it, but who knows! Know what you are in for, and you will probably like it too!

8

Imagine a film that is part Carrie and part The Exorcist combined with a lesbian love story. I know that sounds a bit confusing; but this is a pretty accurate summary of the picture. When the story begins, young Thelma (Eili Harboe) has gone off to college and things seem pretty normal. However, out of the blue, she has what appears to be a grand mal seizure that lands her in the hospital. Soon after, one of the folks who witnessed the seizure, Anja (Kaya Wilkens) introduces herself to Thelma and they soon become friends. In fact, over time they become more than friends as both the women begin having sexual feelings for each other; which causes Thelma to have a huge internal struggle because this violates her strong Christian upbringing. A bit later, Thelma enters the hospital for testing to determine exactly whether or not she has epilepsy. During the testing, her defenses are lowered and her intense feelings for Anya run wild; so wild that Thelma's supernatural powers manifest themselves. What exactly are these powers? And, what family secrets are there related to all this? And, how does this all end? As I said, the story reminds me of a couple other films but it's also original in many ways. It also keeps you guessing; and that's the biggest reason I recommend the picture. Where all this is going and how it gets there make this a very special film, though I have a couple important warnings. First, there are lots and lots of flashing lights and epileptic viewers might have difficulties with this. Second, if you have a strong fear of snakes do not watch this film! There are several snakes in the film but one incredibly vivid dream that is nightmare fodder involving snakes and you need to consider this before you see this excellent movie.

10

Back from the cinema and i am still...wow wow wow. It was just a kinda boring evening, so i took a walk to my favourite cinema in Reykjavik downtown spontaneous. Unfortunately it was the smallest cinema hall but OK i took a set in the middle of the second seat row. So it was like the last seat row in the big cinema hall. Everything was quiet, not many peoples...perfect. And the movie started, first scene, what the hell, OK, curious, interesting and from the beginning to the end, it was just stunning, stunning and stunning. The best movie 2017 i have seen so far!

7

After reading the fantastic reviews and hearing from friends what a great film this was, i went in with big expectations. I was, oddly not to my surprise, a bit let down, and i think others will be too. But

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

that doesn't mean that you shouldn't go out and watch it!

Harboe is the perfect choice for the titular character - every emotion is portrayed with the utmost of believability. Her connection with Anja feels natural and at times entrancing. If Harboe doesn't win an Amanda for Best Actress i'll boycott the award show. Just saying...

The story is engaging, but slow-paced. I don't mind, others might. This is a beautiful piece of art, executed with finesse by Trier. The soundtrack is underscoring the action without adding too much drama, and you've gotta love every moment Susanne Sundfør's music is playing in the background. A perfect fit for this film. The screenplay has a lot of potential, but stumbles here and there. In a way i wish it had been a bit easier on the use of metaphors and symbolism, but at the same time i can't quite grasp what Thelma really is about. Visually, it's stunning - and that's not a given for Norwegian film. But film needs more than stunning photography, cinematography, characters, cgi and music. And that last bit is what's missing here.

Summed up: if you don't like Trier's other films, you might not like this one either. But it's worth the money (!) and your time. Film er best på kino!

10

Lights flicker, the wind rises and animals behave strangely when Thelma becomes agitated. She is capable of mysterious and ethereal powers, and more than she knows because her manipulative and fundamentalist parents keep such things under wraps in home-school. As Thelma heads to college in Oslo and stops taking medications, not only do her parents lose control, she loses control of herself. Psychogenic seizures rack her body. Passions and anxieties multiply along with her abilities. This is when Anja, Thelma's close friend, does something extremely upsetting for Thelma. The next day when Anja can't be found, Thelma has a sickening feeling she had something to do with it. She searches for answers to the secrets and powers that beguile and haunt her.

This thrilling, deep, complex and sensual film explores a whole realm of different theories and possibilities. I was surprised and delighted by its twists and turns. It crosses borders between reality and fantasy, and light and darkness, and explores the good and bad in human nature. The actors are amazing, especially Eili Harboe as Thelma and Kaya Wilkins as Anja. It is fantastic to discover that the roots of psychogenic disorders go back as far as Joan of Arc. Seen at the Toronto International Film Festival.

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range
Failed in 4th loop, list index out of range

Rating: 1

1

Content: 1 , Size: 26

Hey! Have a very nice day.

Rating: 2

2

Content: 2 , Size: 52

I am going outside to play football in this weather.

Rating: 3

3

Content: 3 , Size: 56

Let's get some content from IMDB reviews first shall we?

Rating: 4

4

Content: 4 , Size: 4170

Since the Saw franchise is one of my biggest guilty pleasures when it comes to horror, I've been hoping for a new installment ever since The Final Chapter was supposed to end the franchise back in 2010. Even though the movies got progressively worse, there is something about this franchise that always draws me back and makes me want to re-watch it.

I had high expectations for Jigsaw because of two reasons: one, the producers stated in an interview that they were offered more than a

hundred scripts for a new movie from different writers, but had never been pleased with any of them until they discovered a script so good, which ultimately got picked to be adapted; second, the Spierig brothers, Jigsaw's directors, had previously directed Predestination, such a smart and enticing sci-fi time-travel movie that I liked quite a lot.

After seeing Jigsaw, I left the theater disappointed. I'll start with what I enjoyed:

The score by Charlie Clouser is just as fabulous as it has always been and manages to go in line perfectly with each scene.

The performances didn't bother me at all, although none of the actors really gets to shine. Laura Vandervoort and Paul Braunstein stood out here, with the latter generating some funny moments worthy of admiration.

The direction was very polished and the movie was competently filmed, but the Spierig brothers weren't given much to show their creativity on. This leads me to the negatives.

The CGI is very good. There is, however, one scene in which I was feeling as if I was watching one of the most recent Resident Evil movies and that didn't really work for me.

What I didn't like:

The ideas in this movie and its overall plot are somewhat underdeveloped. I know that this is supposed to be a new beginning for these movies, but as a franchise starter, I wanted more to be explored. The plot falls flat because the movie cuts from scene to scene so swiftly and tries to cram multiple narratives into 85 minutes, that ultimately none of them makes an impact.

Saw is known for its visceral traps and torture devices, so I was looking forward to seeing more of that. However, the game presented in this movie has next to no memorable traps. That is because they are a lot tamer than what we've seen before and they simply can't hold a candle to all the ingenious traps from the past movies.

The character development is another issue in this movie. The characters are so uni-dimensional, with some of them being there only to fill the screen. And I'm referring to some of the main casting here. Also, character arcs are left unfinished and the movie felt like it ended when the most important part of the story was about to happen.

The editing undermines what could've been some very suspenseful scenes because of its sloppiness, by cutting from one narrative (the game) to the other (the investigation) at random moments.

Now, it all comes down to the twist. Was it good and unexpected? Well, no, not really. It's not necessarily because you can predict it from miles away (for which the movie offers hints throughout the run-time) due to its small set of characters, but because it had no resonance for me. It didn't blow me away and you could've predicted it from the marketing of the movie alone. Just like with the traps, it just doesn't have the same visceral feel as the past movies and it doesn't really make you crave for the release of the next chapter.

Overall, Jigsaw sets itself apart from the previous movies in the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

series with the help of the two directors who manage to make the movie look stylish and slick, but ultimately, it doesn't succeed in creating the sense of urgency that some of the old movies had and, sadly, disappoints on almost every other level. And yes, there are fan-service moments, but as a fan of this franchise, I felt very little excitement when they happened.

Hopefully, if the movie does well in terms of box office, the sequel will improve upon this franchise 'reinvention'.

Rating: 5

6

Content: 5 , Size: 1395

As a saw geek, i thought the film was a good film for an average movie goer, but for a fan of the franchise i found it underwhelming. the 'he had another apprentice all along' was lazy in my opinion. The idea Elanor was really Cortbett from saw 3 carrying on jigsaws work (she was around 11 yrs old in saw 3, so the age ties in 7 years on) - this would have been a far more inventive and plausible option than some random character that we are told was on the scene long before Hoffman and Amanda is too weak in my opinion. I also think, making you believe Jigsaw is alive again, only to find out it is scenes from 10 years ago is like giving a kid a Christmas present and taking it away again. However clever, leaves you disappointed. Frustrating. I understand the series needed re-inventing for the new audience, but to forget its old fan base and not have any mention at all of Hoffman, Amanda or Dr Gordon is like ordering Chocolate cake and getting trifle. whilst trifle is nice, its not what you wanted. There are certain rules in a saw film that jigsaw sticks too, well so should the producers.. even if those characters aren't appearing, they should have included someone, even if in name only, especially Dr Gordon as he was alive and well only 7yrs ago and would have known about Logan surely. All in all, a decent film. For a saw fan though its a little disappointing

Rating: 6

8

Content: 6 , Size: 5417

'Let's Play A Game', those simple words haunted the theaters for years, signaling the start of yet another slasher movie in the Saw series. What started out as a unique twist to the serial killer saga was only the start to a face cringing, spine tingling, sometimes nauseating saga that hooked people in until around the sixth-seventh iteration when it finally ended. That was until this year, where the saga was to be reanimated in hopes of bringing more bucks to the theaters. Will this eighth installment have the ability to defy death like it's protagonist antihero, or is it dead like the poor victims of his games. Only one

way to find out and that is read my friends, so let's get started!

LIKES:

Fast-Pace: With all the slow movies I have been seeing, I give props to the Saw series maintaining their consistent pace. From start to finish, the tale keeps moving, sparing no second for unnecessary details or attempts at prolonged character development. The mystery of figuring out the identity of the game master, mixed with the spread-out trials that promise a messy end are well-balanced to keep things going.

Decent Characters: A horror movie often has many brain-dead characters begging to be chainsaw fodder. Fortunately, Saw movies continue to choose players who have a little more complexity and skills than many of the Spring Break teens favored. The tradition lives on, as each player has a little more buried within, still having a few obviously destined corpses, but others who have a shot at making it out. And for those not in the game, but trying to solve the mystery, they too have some layers to them that may or may not be pertinent to the story. It's those engaging elements that are crafted in the story, making them more engaging to follow.

The Presentation: Another component I still like is the presentation of the movie. Many go for the kills, but the better component for me is how they separate the story into two settings. One is still the players trying to escape the closes thing to hell's torture chamber, while the other are the outside characters hunting down the "maniac" that continues to weave his traps. The ability to entangle these two components, balancing their timing to provide clues and hints to the story all while keeping you invested in the game. Such a dynamic presentation provides those checks and balances necessary for a slasher movie, and keeping things as fresh as possible.

Twist: As many of you know, Saw movies are all about the ability to throw that last wrench into the gears to blow your mind. Despite my experience with predicting endings, this one got me. The questions I asked were on the right path, but they were able to drop enough interfering factors to throw me off the trail. Jigsaw once again impresses me with their storytelling, and their mastery of presentation. I can't say much more, but ask the right questions and you might get the answers.

DISLIKES:

Lazy Deaths: Those first few movies were convoluted in their traps. They had designed devices that were an impressive display of imagination, horror, and engineering that gave everyone a kick in terms of design. While Jigsaw still has the impressive connections and storytelling, it unfortunately fails in the terms of the traps themselves. They are surprisingly simple for the most part, and a little more reserved than I expected in this modern era. Yes, there is still plenty of blood in this battle for moral consequences, but they didn't involve quite as much skin crawling madness.

Acting a little cheesy: Despite the engaging characters, there are times when there are a few inconsistencies in the character's intelligence, or often the case their acting. While decent for the most

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

part, the writers hit some blocks in terms of dialogue or direction they wanted the characters to go. There are those moments the tension overwhelms them into hysterical messes that are cheesy rather than believable. In addition, the dialogue sometimes gets lazy, just going into expletives than conducive dialog. A weak dislike yes, but I'm drawing on straws.

The potential for a series: Like the original series, I had hoped for

an ending, but then this movie showed up. While I did enjoy it, I am worried that the way this movie ends sets up the potential for a new series to start. Sure, this means more Saw goodness, but it also means the potential to dilute this movie into another run of the mill series that will become a product of lazy producing. Hopefully that won't happen, but these days series are the prize most companies seek.

The VERDICT:

Jigsaw is the piece of the puzzle that brings quality back to the lovely massacre series. Going back to the roots, the writers were able to bring back a brilliant presentation and characters you can follow. All the nostalgic qualities rush in with the deadly traps, bringing that fast-pace, twisting tale that captivated us all those years ago. While still not the first movie, especially in terms of death design and potential to revive the series, it was a welcome addition to the series. So, if you are looking for the horror movie of the month, Jigsaw is your answer for the theater my friends.

My scores:

Crime/Horror/Mystery: 8.5 Movie Overall: 7.0

Rating: 7

9

Content: 7 , Size: 617

Jigsaw doesn't have over the top traps, where you chop off your arm (Saw VI). OR impossible traps where you put your hand in a jar of acid to retrieve a key just to get your chest ripped open (Saw III). History repeats itself and Jigsaw goes back to their old roots being simple, with basic traps and a mind blowing ending. Unfortunately there's one trap I disliked, it involves lasers. It relies on CGI too much, the stakes are high but the practical traps are way more fun and creative. With wires, tricks, chains, a puppet and the classic pig head, this film will leave you with a smile on your face.

Rating: 8

7

Content: 8 , Size: 1134

October 26, 2017 Middle East Premiere Dubai

It's been 10 years since the death of John Kramer known as the Jigsaw.

But, some bodies are discovered, the investigation leads to the conclusion that Kramer is back...!! Now, the Officials are chasing the dead.

Saw released in 2004 was one of the best Gore, Slasher Suspense Horror Thrillers. After the completion of film school, Director James Wan with

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

his friend Leigh Whannell wanted to make a short film, but limitations hold their hands. Hence, they decided to make something that has limited location, actors etc. This short film of 9 minutes gave green signal to the Saw movie. But, the franchise was rated straight down from Part 1 to 7.

This movie is from the Directors of Predestination (2014), Spierig

Brothers... hold on, don't expect much. But, if you are a fan of Saw film, you can take a breath. Definitely this is not as bad as the previous installments.

Mostly, a cocktail of the previous films. The beginning was really good, it had hope and expectations about the movie. This dropped soon. But, managed to pick up towards the end.

Rating: 9

6

Content: 9 , Size: 3222

Jigsaw is back for an eighth film after several years from the conclusion of a terrible supposedly final chapter saw movie. Jigsaw is an okay film, its not terrible neither good. With directors The Spierig Brothers direction and a new set of writers trying to bring back the Jigsaw killer. There was a way of continuing on with the franchise either with a new twists that tries to bring back the torture porn of death traps and either a new killer or perhaps Jigsaw's legacy was not over.

I enjoyed the first few Saw films from the bloody gory death traps, the

connection on how every victim has with each other, and the twists that is played with Charlie Clouser's music theme in the final minute of the movies. As every film goes on, it just feels like they straying away from the plots connection and having new victims that has no connections and more bloody traps. Jigsaw film however, does not feel like a Saw movie. The plot feels more like a police procedural drama, were Det. Halloran (Callum Keith Rennie) is following up a case were bodies are discovered. And same with the video tapes of Jigsaw's voice (Tobin Bell). Is the Jigsaw really dead? Or is there a new Jigsaw copycat that is taking over his games? Halloran is trying to follow a lead that has several people playing the game in a hidden barn. Were they are fighting for their lives of going through several death traps, as they are suppose to solve the clues to why they are there. With the help from forensic pathologist Logan and Eleanor (Matt Passmore and Hannah Emily Anderson). They are trying to solve their own mystery when traces of evidence is leading back to Jigsaw being alive and the connections every victim has with each other.

The plot played like a TV police procedural drama which took away from the Saw movies feel. It was fun to see Halloran trying to solve the mystery with the victims and Jigsaw. And than the movie flashes back to the victims in the barn, who are forced to play a game that will end bloody.

The death traps and the bloody sequences are quick and less gory

than

the previous seven films. And the traps are also quite forgettable this time. Sure, for the audience that can not handle blood and gore will still find this disturbing.

There are also a couple of unpredictable twists that works with the film and is what leaves you talking about it. Definitely not as great as the first film. The cast was also decent. Matt Passmore is a fun new addition. Callum Keith Rennie was okay. And the cast of victims that were forced in death traps are not easily memorable.

Like all horror films, the first couple are usually the best and the rest are just repeats with less of a plot. And this film does not add or bring anything new to the direction of the franchise. Overall, Jigsaw is a fair horror film. The twists works well. The thrills is decent with the victims being forced to injure themselves to survive. The plot does not feel like the Saw movies. And the death traps are forgettable.

I rate the film 3 out of 5 stars. I ll recommend it if you want to watch a bloody torture porn film or if your into that. Otherwise, I ll suggest it as a rental.

Rating: 10

7

Content: 10 , Size: 617

I have seen the first 3 movies in the series as the reviews of the successors were not good. But I am happy that they made reference to these movies. And this time no flashbacks!

The production design and visuals (gore and blood) were genuine for the viewer to believe. The traps are quite forgettable this time but the twists and turns were very good as I didn't see that coming in the end.

An attempt being made by the directors to make it comparable with the first two installments. Though there are some flaws in the middle, but the ending justified the shortcomings!

Worth your money!

Rating: 11

7

Content: 11 , Size: 1175

I'm fan of Saw franchise since I was teenager, so my hype about this new entry was so high. The movie has 2 plots, one showing 5 victims needing to survive to the dangerous games of Jigsaw and other telling us the story about a police department investigating some stranger homicides.

The plot about the surviving group is nice, there are some creative traps, however there's less violence and bloody scenes than in the previous entries and also has some plot holes, for example Jigsaw seems to know who would survive since the beginning. During the middle of the movie I was wondering how's possible Jigsaw recorded a tape with the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

name of that character? How he knows that character is alive? He could die during the beginning of the game". Meanwhile, the plot about the polices gives us some great twists and I'm sure you won't see them coming.

Jigsaw is a sequel with some reboot elements, doesn't change the horror

genre, but is funny and I suggest it for who wants to turn off the brain for 90 minutes and just enjoy a nice movie. It's not the best Saw film, however is one of the bests.

Rating: 7/10

Rating: 12

6

Content: 12 , Size: 943

I was a huge fan of the original series, although as more films were released the thrill lessened. The first is a Classic and may have one of the best twists of all time, and that's what makes it such a great film. It wasn't about the horror.

This one, although entertaining, same awkward acting by many characters, same grizzly traps, and most of all a twist, which I believe everyone expects, however I feel there's some major plot holes that leaves me feeling dissatisfied. Of course I won't ruin for anyone, but this film reaches far, way too far, in my humble opinion.

Very reminiscent of the original, but fails in the end. Maybe they'll do better next time because a new Saw film is always welcome to take a swing.

Note: the red headed coroner was super hot, even before she let her hair down and took her glasses off. Way too hot to be a coroner. (not being sexist, just keeping it real)

Rating: 13

6

Content: 13 , Size: 1551

Saw is back and Jigsaw has returned to reclaim Halloween. But, you'll immediately find yourself confused. After all, Jigsaw has been dead for many years. As soon as you start watching a lot of things just don't make even a hint of sense. Everything seems jumbled up... until the film's many twists and turns become clear and, with yet another rising crescendo of the iconic theme tune, a series of flashbacks, big reveals and gory images, a Saw film once more concludes seemingly laughing at its audience and said audience will once more leave feeling sick to the stomach and very confused. Yep, Saw is back... for better or for worse? In this case, for better. Kind of. After the horrendous last installment, the only good part of Jigsaw's legacy was the roller coaster at Thorpe Park. Now... maybe things could be back on track. It hasn't redeemed the franchise; the usual bad acting, logic gaps and lack of genuine scares still applies. But at the same time, this installment prioritizes thought provoking moral themes and tension over gore and flashbacks and it is an intense, unsettling experience. With

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

memorable death scenes, a reasonable amount of tension and a relatively solid plot, this should be satisfying enough to most. It doesn't entirely feel like Saw since virtually no-one, not even those still alive, returns from the previous films and the grimy, unclean atmosphere of the old films is replaced by a cleaner, more high-tech vibe, but many will like the various nods to the past movies.

6/10

Rating: 14

9

Content: 14 , Size: 426

Very enjoyable saw movie with more backstory. Kinda funny at times but still just as sick and twisted with plenty of blood and guts. You gotta love the bucket heads, an instant saw classic trap. Ending was mind blowing as always and I'm glad to see saw going back to it's roots. Can't wait to see where this new trilogy will go. If you have seen the first seven saw films you definitely have to see this one!

Rating: 15

6

Content: 15 , Size: 3121

It would be totally fine if SAW franchise had ended at the 7th installment, however, I don't mind that there's a new one, let's break down why

Jigsaw is the 8th installment, and surprisingly, it's not that bad, but it's kind of unnecessary and doesn't feel warranted

It does have it's positives

They have changed some things especially the visual style. When the trailer came out, i was disappointed that they had done away the gritty look of the previous SAW films and are bringing a new cleaner visual style that felt a little less scary but after watching the film, i have to say, the visual style is a breathe of fresh air and a nice change up

Another good thing is that the film focuses less on the torture porn aspect and instead it focuses more on solving the puzzle aspect of the traps. They have toned down the violence, but i'm okay with that because they did focus on making the traps more of a challenge instead of a torture. But if we talk about the traps, yes there were a very few maybe one or two original and innovative traps but the rest were very uninspired and a less gore-y versions of some traps from previous SAW films

The film does have a cool and unexpected turn of events. There's an interesting mystery going on and an intriguing "whodunnit" story line that keeps you guessing

Let's get down to negatives

I know that the directors of this film, Spierig brothers are good at their jobs and they know how to make a film and i really liked their previous film that was Predestination but here, even though they showed

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

that they understood the basis and core aspects of SAW franchise, they could not manage to deliver anything too impressive or anything we haven't seen before except the overall change of tone and visual style

The writing is mediocre, but like i said it does have some cool twists that you may not see coming, it still is very cliché and mediocre. Like always, there is excessive use of flashbacks to tell many parts of the story, which may not be a negative but excessive use is excessive and can be considered lazy at times

I've seen critics mentioning the cringe-y acting and i agree that in many scenes, some acting is very over the top and a bit cringe-y

Wrapping up the review, i would say, Jigsaw is not as good as it could have been but its not the worst of the franchise. In fact, it may be like the 4th or 5th best film in the SAW series if i had to rank them in terms of quality

I do appreciate that Jigsaw combines some of the best ideas of some SAW films and delivers some good moments but it barely does anything to justify its existence beyond making more money for the franchise

If you like most of the SAW films, you may enjoy this one too. Even if you only like the first few SAW films, i would say give this a chance if you want to, you may end up liking it. It's an easy watch with a small run time that doesn't drag too much and it's very fast paced.

i would give it 6/10

Rating: 16

6

Content: 16 , Size: 3247

This one upset me. This was the most engaging saw film since 1. Loved the detective/crime story as usual and FOR ONCE I wasn't subjected to just gory nonsense. It's a bit gruesome and grisly due to the morgue photos and dead bodies - oh yes there was blood - but they saved the big gore till the end as a payoff. Loved it up until the end where it all falls apart.

The ending itself was stupid. I would have laughed at the killers final line (it's so PATHETIC compared to saw 1's "game over") but I was sitting there with jaw on the floor from how BAD the ending was. Ruined everything. I even forgave the lapses in logic cuz it's saw and when saw is good - it's fun. I thought the traps were well done and the silo trap was the best since maybe the shotgun tilt a whirl of 6. Too many things unanswered, some missing characters...

SPOILERS

I thought the main chick was gonna be Jeff's daughter - and she wasn't so I was really upset about that lol When the killer is revealed I was dumbfounded... I liked the cast a lot and thought it was well written on the whole but just all comes apart at the reveal. Tobin's scene was great - the highlight of the movie. I guessed that the game had already happened - seemed obvious right?

What happened to Ella(?) and what happened to one leg guy? I thought

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

tobin was dr. gordon at first - then I remembered it already happened - but where is he? Where's Hoffman? I loved the cancer diagnosis angle - that was great but I was really hoping we'd find out her last name was Denlan. I ended my fan edit of all films in one long ass movie with the "don't trust the one who saves you' part... I really thought that was where they were gonna go - with Jeff's daughter...oh well.

END OF SPOILERS

In the end they got a lot right but the wrong ruined what was the best

one (maybe 3rd best) after the original. Really disappointed and I have no idea how to include it my fan edit cuz it almost seems insulting to put it in cuz it has nothing to do with series almost. A real WASTE of a good ride.

I think the blade on this saw has finally dulled - this new direction

just seems like it will ruin the original series. That's what's SO maddening about this movie - I loved it until the end. It was MORE than making up for the unwatchable POS that was 7.

So can I say watch it? Yeah but it will disappoint you but the ride is worthy enough if we still had videos stores. "Watch when it comes on TV" is vague and it sounds stupid. Wait for it on video was always an easy good review lol

I'd rank the films from best to last -

Saw (4 stars - a classic in it's own way) Saw VI (4 stars - great sequel) Saw IV (3 1/2 stars. Best twist in the series. best misdirection) Saw III (3 1/2 stars - it's just SO bloody and mean and nasty. A real mean spirited movie) Saw II (3 stars - good sequel. still fun)

Saw V (**1/2) I like it but only works as a piece and not it's own movie) Jigsaw (** stars) Almost best since original - terrible ending) Saw VII - utter trash. Used about 12 mins of it in my edit lol

Peace.

Rating: 17

6

Content: 17 , Size: 914

I am in a unique position because I would not have chosen to go and see this movie. I was invited to it for a friends birthday, I can give you my honest opinion with no prior experience\expectations with the franchise.

Not once did I feel I was missing out having not knowing the series, As

a stand alone movie it did well misdirecting suspicion in some parts. However in a lot of movie I found myself telegraphing what was going to happen and knowing what was there for a second viewing which I like to be in the dark for until the second time round. I can forgive this cause there won't be a next time. The people I was with all said the same thing... "The first was the best, and the movies went downhill until this one."

The acting was good the effects were better.

However, the twist at the end was a masterpiece I will give it that. No one could have seen that coming.

Rating: 18

10

Content: 18 , Size: 1011

I was very excited when the first jigsaw trailer was online and my hopes were extremely high. When the film premiered I immediately went to see it and my god I was mind blown by the plot and characters. Like previous saw films the story is some what the same with a few added twist to each characters background. The puppet looks very awesome with new features added and Tobin bell still does the voice of him which was very amazing. I finally happy to see films like this getting back to what the term HORROR is frankly there hasn't been any good horror films that were great. Mainly nowadays horror films tend to be you're typical tacky cliché; jumpscare gimmick with annoying loud banging sound and mainly focusing on cheap demon/ ghost filth & the conjuring, the babadook, bye bye man, ouija, sinister, oculus, paranormal activity and those dreadful insidious films. Finally horror movies are getting back to it roots of pure horror because humans are the one that you should be scared.

Rating: 19

6

Content: 19 , Size: 1450

There will be spoilers in the last paragraph.

When I saw the first trailer I was stoked on seeing it first. Now that I've seen it, it brought some pretty disappointing moments where I wanted the series to be changed.

First off I wanted to see more unanswered plot holes from Saw The Final Chapter like why some people were involved and stuff. Second, I thought they would be adding more modern technology in the mix. Third, I expected a whole new feeling to the film that was different from the others. Finally fourth, I wanted Waaaay more mystery and drama.

Although this film didn't meet my expectations it's still ranking 3 out of all the saw movies. There was nothing new and if they are to make a sequel they better add something new to the series. I gave it a 6/10 for it's come back to the series, it's new traps, and it's twist I SAW coming. We need a new Jig from the series c'mon!

!SPOILER! I easily saw 2/3rds of the plot coming when they first mentioned the spiral trap and the rumor he used it before every other one of his victims. Also I knew it was that dude who faked him dying by the lasers because we've seen it before in Saw 1, also because they found skin sampled in his freezer. Ultimately the twist was pretty easy to see. Sorry to bring your hopes down but they should've left it Saw: Legacy and made JIGSAW a new, brighter, more innovative movie after.

Rating: 20

10

Content: 20 , Size: 480

I'm a huge fan of the Saw franchise & I never saw this coming a Prequel an a Sequel all rolled into one , my mind is blown away . Jigsaw is brilliantly written as they all are , the traps are especially good & the twist was incredible & spoiler coming that we were watching a prequel game all along ! and the reveal of Jigsaw so we think he's alive ! my jaw was on the floor ! the 7 years has been worth the wait as Jigsaw exceeded my expectation .

Rating: 21

6

Content: 21 , Size: 897

I agree that JIGSAW is an unnecessary sequel in the SAW franchise, but if I'm honest the whole series has been unnecessary, aside from the first movie. This one's a densely-plotted lukewarm rehash of previous sequels and ideas, with five characters engaging in more against-the-clock deadly traps while the detectives on the outside attempt to figure out whether the killer Jigsaw really is back and on the prowl again.

As with the sequels, this is pretty confusing stuff although it all

makes sense towards the end, although I wasn't all that convinced by some of the twists. An aged Tobin Bell returns to his role (thanks to one of the aforementioned twists) and is a welcome presence, and the traps are gruesome and nasty, although not the most inventive of the franchise. All together, this is acceptable fare, although not a film you'll want to bother revisiting.

Rating: 22

6

Content: 22 , Size: 4199

The Saw franchise went downhill since the original back in 2004. Though it was assumed to have ended in 2010, another sequel has arrived seven years later. My main concern with this was the fact that it was probably going to end up being another film that's made for fans of violence and gore, who enjoy this series just for the traps and who makes it out alive. While Jigsaw is exactly that, there are many more layers to this film than I was expecting, making for a somewhat enjoyable viewing experience. I won't be recommending this movie to anyone who has never seen a previous installment, nor will I recommend it to those who have and have disliked it from the beginning. Jigsaw isn't going to win any new fans over, but in terms of popcorn horror entertainment, I think you can still do much worse than Jigsaw. It tries very hard to please hardcore fans, and I truly believe that it does so. This really isn't all that great of a movie, but let's dive

into why it's better than it deserves to be.

Like always, you follow the police as they try to solve the mystery of the ongoing puzzle so that they can try and save as many lives as possible. These films exist for their traps nowadays, but I have to give credit where credit is due and offer some applause to the neat little twists this movie pulls off throughout its final act. Like most of these sequels, the twists are too little and too late, but you can tell that the writers care about trying to give the audience a little more than just killing people in inventive ways.

The characters throughout this film receive some backstory, but that's also the biggest issue I had with this movie as a whole. Looking back on it, I appreciate the fact that each of the characters throughout the core game was fleshed out more than I was expecting them to be, but they honestly make you hate every one of the players, which was a huge distraction from me, having absolutely nobody to root for. Yes, the majority of these movies are like that, but there was always someone to latch onto, hoping they would make it out alive. Instead, we receive a slew of characters that have all made terrible decisions in the past, forcing you to slightly be okay with what the killer is doing to them.

Although I didn't care about any of the characters, Jigsaw found a way to win me over in the end, with a few very clever reveals, making the characters themselves seem less relevant anyway. You don't go into a Saw movie to see fleshed out characters, but when a movie can ground itself and invest you even in the slightest, points can be given for that. The character of John Kramer is the character who's fleshed out the most here, giving a small, but detailed level to the franchise itself, which was quite the surprise for me.

The deaths themselves are pretty impressive in terms of being memorable because everything from Saw IV to Saw VII is a complete blur to me. I'll be remembering some of the set pieces when looking back on Jigsaw and that's easily more than I was able to say about most of the sequels that this franchise has offered through the years. There are nods to previous deaths throughout some of the games and there's definitely a reason behind that, which makes it worth waiting until the end.

Overall, like I said, Jigsaw won't win over any new viewers, but fans of the franchise will be able to appreciate the cleverness that it has to offer when it ties itself into the timeline of the series. The dialogue is very generic, the story itself isn't anything you haven't already seen, and the characters are extremely forgettable. That being said, the traps are fun, the conclusion is satisfying for those who have followed the series from the beginning, and the spirit of the original is still present enough to warrant a recommendation for hardcore fans. Jigsaw works for what it sets out to achieve, but it's still the same old schtick. I had a fun time with this movie because I've seen every other film in the franchise and I still found this one of the best. It's really not that bad in retrospect.

Rating: 23

8

Content: 23 , Size: 1154

So it has been a long time since a Saw film came out but this was certainly worth the wait. Jigsaw is not very scary but it isn't trying to be. It is a smart and fun entry that modernizes the Saw franchise. It was REALLY cool to see Tobin Bell on the big screen again, like that guy is so freakin cool! The characters range from cool to not cool, but the worst character is the one who survives! It's the person you wanted to see die the most, yet he walks out A-OKAY. These Saw movies have a knack for doing that! The gore in this movie is INCREDIBLE and features downright the BEST gore moment of the entire Saw franchise, where a guy's head is split down the middle like an apple slicer. It had me cheering, because it is not only the best gore moment in the entire Saw franchise but one of the best gory moments I've ever seen in theaters! The twist at the end sent chills down my spine, like wow I never would've guessed it and it made so much sense too. I was so happy this film was good. I would probably rank it in fourth place behind Saw 1, 2, and 3, and it ties with Saw 6. I would recommend you buy a ticket tonight!

Rating: 24

4

Content: 24 , Size: 383

Hollywood's cash cow advantage for Halloween. The traps were meh. Too tamed compared to other saw movies. The twist at the end was awful nearly the whole movie turns out to be one big flashback. Flashbacks are starting to become an annoying cliché both in movies and TV series. It's a sequel that didn't need to be made. I recommend not bothering with this one.

Rating: 25

8

Content: 25 , Size: 746

REVIEW - JIGSAW
Who remembers the very first Saw film and how through the course of the many films the whole premise seemed to get lost to the investigation.
The premise that it was a game with an outcome you could choose.
In many ways this latest installment returns to the original premise but.....
Generally a good (not great) film but certainly worth your time.
One or two plot holes which of course I will not give away.
My biggest problem with the film is why? As with Ghost In The Machine, why tell us the complete story in one film, why not leave us wanting more?
The above doesn't generally spoil the film which does have a lot of

twists and turns.

Rating 8 out of 10

Rating: 26

7

Content: 26 , Size: 1452

I saw "Jigsaw";, starring Tobin Bell-24_tv, The Quick and the Dead; Matt Passmore-The Glades_tv, Son of the Mask; Callum Keith Rennie-Longmire_tv, Fifty Shades of Grey and Laura Vandervoort-Ted, Smallville_tv. This is the 8th movie in the 'Saw' franchise and yes, I know, the last one back in 2010 was called the final chapter but he's back-you just can't keep a good man down. This is the first Saw movie that has the character's name, Jigsaw, in the title. What is remarkable to me is that Jigsaw/Tobin was killed off in the third Saw movie but the producers keep coming up with ways for him to make an appearance-and yes, they have an explanation here, too. This one starts with bodies turning up dead and all the evidence points to one man as being responsible, Tobin. Callum is the lucky policeman that gets to try and match wits with Tobin. Matt plays the medical examiner that gets to autopsy all the dead bodies showing up-and some of them are in pretty bad shape. Laura is one of the lucky contestants that gets to play Tobin's games, and yes, they are just as gruesome as always. Now I know that these movies are not for everyone-my wife hates them-but if you do like them, then you will probably enjoy this one, too. I know I did. It's rated "R" for grisly bloody violence, torture and language and has a running time of 1 hour & 31 minutes. I enjoyed it and would buy it on DVD.

Rating: 27

10

Content: 27 , Size: 345

The best horror movie in the world with this section as well he showed me that he was still brilliant. The story is well designed, a sight is a flawless point as we like :) I have no idea how much idiot critic instead of shutting down everything why they do not settle down movie? I find it outrageous to get rid of movies that are not should.

Rating: 28

5

Content: 28 , Size: 1577

So,tonight Jigsaw premiered in my cinema and for some reason,the cinema room was empty,so,that was OK,I was alone. The film followed the story of another guilty bunch who are pursued in to a game of grisly games as the new killer may actually be Jigsaw himself,yes,Jigsaw. So,I actually kind of wished I did not have to see this,I had already gone on a big shopping spree with my family,surprising me due to it being my birthday

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

and afterwards,I was wrecked..but,for you guys,I saw it! The opening scene in Jigsaw made me actually wanna fall asleep,I was really tired but sat through the whole thing and was it worth it..not really. I kind of wished to be honest,I did not see Jigsaw,wasting money on myself,the film was just another crappy Saw film,well,not too crappy. Jigsaw was not really all that bad,I thought the traps though were kind of poor having it have the exact same kind of theme of traps to Saw V,one thing though I did love about this film was the ending that really had me like..what?! I wont spoil,but it was a brilliant ending,the acting in the film was OK,something that was weird was the setting,I felt also that this was not even a Saw film,when you think about the first seven having been set in old dungeons and stuff,this had barley any resemblance to it which is something that I admired,the actual very ending to the film was OK with that trap at the end being definitely crap,I mean,like there's bad traps,but the laser one..OH MY GOD!! Jigsaw is a mixed sequel with good things and bad things but at the end of the day,will Saw ever change?

Rating: 29

6

Content: 29 , Size: 5731

From 2004 to 2010, we were greeted with a Saw film once every Halloween. Each film built on the foundation of the previous film, literally deeming them as iterations of one another. Now that time has past between films and new films and ideas have come out since then in the torture porn genre (I hate using that phrase, especially to describe the first film), new ground had to be broken. There are die-hard Saw fans like myself who know most every little intricacy of the first seven films, but nobody cares about the old formula anymore. It tired itself out. Instead of reiterating, it was now time to innovate. Enter co-writers Josh Stolberg & Pete Goldfinger and co-directors Michael & Peter Spierig, and in Halloween of 2017 you get Jigsaw.

All of this follows an eerily similar path to the Jurassic Park franchise. JP had sequels that, while in-name they hold their own, after a while started turn away some moviegoers and even got close to jumping the shark if it continued down the beaten path. So they created some space between themselves for some years, and came back with a re-branding. Both films (Jigsaw and Jurassic World) serve as standalone films if you so want to treat them as such or jump into them anew, play off their respective first films in terms of content and paying proper homage, modernize themselves and play more to a general casual audience (Jigsaw domestically, JW globally), can and probably will churn out its own set of sequels, and let veterans of the franchises appreciate the small bits that played off any one of the previous installments. Jurassic World lives in a PG-13 setting though and caved in to more Hollywood tropes (including CGI), plus is a much higher budget film, but Jigsaw still breaks a lot of new ground that will not play

familiarly to the Saw films of old.

When Darren Lynn Bousman jumped on board to direct Saw II, he noted in the commentary track what some of the 'staples' were for the franchise, including quick-cuts. While I don't agree with that assessment, this continued for his next two films in the franchise, and directors David Hackl and Kevin Greutert followed up with a similar format. The films also found themselves in flashback haven, remained almost exclusively within interior settings, and centralized a set of characters to connect within a small universe. Jigsaw opens up to the feeling that this is taking place in a larger city and environment, letting characters in and out of the games explore more and be realer people (in that they do not just serve the purpose of the film alone, like they have lives outside of what we see). The framing of the film has changed, the color palette has widened, Charlie Clouser's score is not as in-your-face, and the production simply doesn't feel as cheap. Right steps were made in making this film much more accessible, and I see this continuing in the future.

While Jurassic World actually seems to remove the sequels from canon (we will see if that's true with Jeff Goldblum's appearance in Fallen Kingdom), Jigsaw plays strongly in the sense that if you go without seeing, recalling, or keeping in mind Saw 4-7, you will be okay. Hoffman is completely out of the picture in Jigsaw, never once mentioned or concerned about. The only traits to be aware of in those films was that John lost a child, was once in a relationship with Jill Tuck, and there was an autopsy performed on his body. In fact, you could just as easily disregard specifics about Saw II and Saw III, and you will probably be okay. Knowing that John Kramer was killed in the third film just might be enough.

This one really mostly plays off the first film to be most effective, though. Aside from the elaborateness of the traps and games being made (which could transition more smoothly seeing the other seven films first), we can leave the first film understanding that a cancer-stricken individual puts victims in life-or-death scenarios because of moral sins they have committed, and if killed get a puzzle piece cut out of their bodies. Seasoned individuals will also find some of the twists in the new film somewhat predictable simply because they know how Jigsaw thinks (or really, how the writers think). There were over a half-dozen twists, and I probably guessed or suspected the majority of them. Didn't make the film any inferior because I'm sitting and thinking about the casual moviegoer experiencing this film, and I think the best thing you can do for yourself now is at least see the first film and heck even at most know the outcome of the original trilogy. Saw IV, V, VI and The Final Chapter now all end up being fan-service flicks, unless any Jigsaw sequels end up coming back to them more than they have now.

I liked this movie. It could've been a complete garbage escapade like the seventh film was, and it wasn't. This reignites the franchise after it had stalled out and breathes fresh air. Maybe we will get a couple

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

more within the next few Halloweens, because there is something to explore but I don't know how they'll want to do it. It is up to their creative bones now, and I like that facet of it because they can make good films if they try their darnedest in doing so.

If this film interests you enough that you want to give the first film a chance and haven't yet, go to Netflix right now to check it out, consider completing the original trilogy if you loved it enough to see what happens next, and check out this film when you're able to. I've reached my 1000-word limit, so now I'll just leave you here with my franchise ranking:

1, 3, 6, 2, J, 5, 4, 7

Rating: 30

6

Content: 30 , Size: 657

For me the best thing about sequel is the unity. Each one of them complete the others missing parts. This one is totally apart from the rest

About movie, thriller wasn't enough, traps wasn't excited, spilled blood wasn't enough.

Storyline seem like rushed, was weak. I expected much more. Was disappointing for me.

At the end i waited for "Game over" with shutted door. At least don't take it away from me right. But they did.

Worst one of the sequel for me . Sorry about that. It is disgrace for John's legacy.

By the way Laura Vandervoort your color is the brown thrust me "3C;3

Rating: 31

1

Content: 31 , Size: 344

Worst hour and a half of my life. That's all that needs to be said but since IMDb requires you to write 5 lines in a review I'll explain why. Firstly, it was horrible. I didn't find it thrilling at any point and the story line was just confusing and not good. I definitely could of written a better movie when I was in grade 3.

Rating: 32

9

Content: 32 , Size: 1991

Even though people rarely admit it, the "Saw" series has been one of the highest quality horror series ever made. "Jigsaw" is the eighth entry in the series and there is still yet to be a bad film made amongst them. Some are undoubtedly better than others, but I defy you to point me out one that is inherently bad. I also defy you to show me another horror series (even any type of series at all is rare) that has

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

maintained quality across that many films. That's why I was so happy that Jigsaw was a brilliant movie, because if they had come back seven years later only to put forward a bad film for the sake of making money it would have ruined everything. Luckily that was not the case though.

While this one does follow the formula used in all the past films, it also feels quite unique in a number of ways. The original seven films were all set within a very tight time-frame. This one of course is pushing ten years into the future. This adds layers of intrigue to the proceedings, because how could Jigsaw be committing these crimes when he died all those years back? And you just know they're going to have a brilliant answer to that question.

As far as the traps go in this one, I'm not too sure how I feel. None of them were bad, however none of them really blew me away either. My favourite one (without giving away any spoilers) was actually the most simple one in the film involving a gun. The psychology behind that one is what I loved. I love when these films aren't afraid to be intelligent.

The twist in this one also caught me completely off-guard. I've heard people say they weren't entirely convinced by it and felt that the film cheated, however I disagree. Nothing is off limits coming in a Saw movie. You have to know that going in. Altogether I absolutely loved this film and would thoroughly recommend it to anyone who is in anyway interested in the genre.

Rating: 33

6

Content: 33 , Size: 1487

Saw has had many ups and downs as a series. The final chapter in 2010 was about as limp as soggy bread, giving us nothing shocking and a long-expected twist.

Jigsaw begins anew (don't expect Hoffman or Dr. Gordon to return) and

features new characters and a new set of games. But...how can this be if John Kramer died over ten years ago? Is he really dead? He has to be. Right?

There are definite improvements here. The cinematography and production

design is light years beyond the previous movies. I used to refer to Saw having fakemography with some of the rudest, ugliest, and cheapest filters and color corrections ever to dirty the big screen. Jigsaw, being the first to be shot in 2.35:1, actually looks cinematic and it's the film's best feature. The games and traps themselves are gruesome but not overplayed, which took the focus away from torture porn and gave it a bit more of the psychological edge we got in the first movie.

Sadly, it fails elsewhere. The story gives us YET MORE cops, YET MORE

coroners, and YET MORE doctors (all of them forgettable) filling up the side story. Sorry, but after a seven-year hiatus this should have been more unique and subversive. I gotta admit though, that twist ending had

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

me kicking myself, and Charlie Clouser's score is as intense as ever.

Not a bad film, but not the huge comeback it should have been. I rank it somewhere in the middle of the series overall.

Rating: 34

10

Content: 34 , Size: 300

What can I say? As a huge SAW fan I was so exited for this movie. It didn't disappoint me at all! Great actors, great traps, gorgeous music.. And last but not least, a thrilling story and spine-chilling feeling through the whole movie! A golden comeback for the franchise! Great job Lionsgate!

Rating: 35

5

Content: 35 , Size: 813

I love the Saw movies don't get me wrong, but this movie although it was filmed very well and even had its funny cool moments just seemed like a repeat of something that was already seen. Do not get me wrong I loved seeing the new torture devices, but to see how each of them died and it ended up with no one winning, but finding out Jigsaw saved and trained another person seemed very predictable and overrated. I think this movie would have been awesome if turned out Jigsaw did not actually die and came back with an even more serious vengeance and did not give people a chance, but killed them in his own selective way and the last one to survive had a chance to save their own life. As far as the ending for this movie I thought was predictable and repeated. This movie could have been so much better.

Rating: 36

10

Content: 36 , Size: 891

Of course,its not my favorite part of this fantastic movie,BUT!I think everybody knows,that a lot of movies which has continuation, becoming more and more boring part by part.For example Pirates of Caribbean sea. i don't so like first 35m of movie.I saw it few hours ago,and at first 35 m i was thinking that - Oh no,please,lets something happen,because i have feeling,that it will be another movie,which makes me boring after his older parts,but this part,i can say,that makes me feel,what i was feeling after first,second and sixth parts...when you are starting to think after the end of movie....and for me this is one of the best continuation parts i have ever seen.Sure,there are a lot of not logical moments,but steel,for 8th part its brilliant work.Please make 9th part better...make Cramer alive,because you open that idea in 8th part....thank you for not boring continuation.

Rating: 37

3

Content: 37 , Size: 1509

Right I am a big fan of this franchise... A real big fan so that when I was at the school I even made a film that is inspired by the franchise... Even though I am not proud of the film considering it was tight on budget and time Eventually it was shown at numerous film festivals around the world because it was catchy, commercial and current...

So last week after seeing Jigsaw I was shocked to see my plot being turned into feature length script,shot and presented to me in the cinema...

Some might call this as plot similarity which I doubt... As even the writers made the same mistakes as I did... (Those flat characters in Jigsaw... In a short film I had limited time to establish a character anyway)

Secondly Both mine and Jigsaw twists the time... Which is the main similarity... Which means the bodywork of the films are literally the SAME...

Second thing to note is at first those bucket heads did not mean a lot to me... Why they were there to begin with... Until I spot the first similarity about the plot...

Literally my work is inspired from ice bucket challenge... So you now know where those bucket heads are coming from...

Interesting coincidence one might even doubt if it is a coincidence or an indirect COPY & PASTE product...

you can check my short on youtube under Game Of Death Terms & Conditions short film if you are a writer it would be easy for you to understand the similarities...

let me know what you think...

Rating: 38

9

Content: 38 , Size: 347

This saw movie was actually one of the best ones. This movie had its scary moments and its funny moments, I give it a 9/10 because i have been waiting for a long time, I actually got to learn what happened after all these years but disappointing because Gordon and Hoffman weren't revealed. We still don't know what happened to them :(

Rating: 39

9

Content: 39 , Size: 854

If you love horror/thriller type of movies you must have seen at least one of Saw movies. It's been 7 years since the last Saw movie and with this one Jigsaw makes a great comeback. Like all Saw movies this one is also tied with the other ones and also gives you a new perspective

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

about the previous ones. The plot looks simple at first. Looking like a classic John Kramer game where he wants justice and trying to teach a lesson to his chosen players. But as the movie continues it gets more complicated and it keeps you on the edge of your seat which is great. And as we get to climax part of the movie the legendary Saw music starts playing and all of the things that you are confused about is explained and you're just left with an open mouth. Because the plot twist is really good and a clever one. So i think this is a really must see!!

Rating: 40

6

Content: 40 , Size: 1974

Tyler Perry is something of an American phenomenon; a one-man motion picture industry. As a director, writer, or producer; and frequently all three; Perry since 2005 has been responsible for some twenty remarkably successful motion pictures. And that's in addition to the pictures of other filmmakers in which Perry has appeared only as an actor; popular films such as Star Trek, Alex Cross, and Gone Girl. To date, nine of Tyler Perry's twenty pictures as a producer, writer, or director have featured the character Madea, a plain-spoken and tough-loving elderly woman with a nurturing heart, a highly-acute antenna for the difference between right and wrong, and a penchant for involving herself in the troubles of other people. Madea, who's played in elaborate makeup and costuming by Perry himself, is based in equal measures upon the filmmaker's mother and aunt, and is partially inspired by the characterizations and performances by comic Eddie Murphy in the 2000 comedy The Nutty Professor II. Tyler Perry's comedies are remarkably accessible to filmgoing audiences. While the motion pictures of other filmmaking multi-taskers often appeal to an especially exclusive and rarefied demographic; Woody Allen springs to mind; Perry's movies are popular entertainment for anyone who loves to laugh. Unfortunately, Boo 2! is not among Perry's best pictures; or even among his best Madea pictures. While the laughs are there, especially for Perry's legions of fans and Madea aficionados, they're more sparse than usual, and less frequent. Both the filmmaker and the character he created seem to be going through the motions by rote, and without heart. Boo 2! is enjoyable enough. But audiences unfamiliar with Tyler Perry or Madea might find themselves wondering what all the fuss is about.

Rating: 41

6

Content: 41 , Size: 5619

Hellur! Tyler Perry's signature character has made her mark for so many years, teaching lessons in her own unique manner. These movies have come in all sorts of scenarios, many being close carbon copies of the predecessors that laid the foundation. This series continues to rope loyal fans into the theater though, never tiring of the gimmicks cooked up at Perry Studios. Tonight, the sequel to Madea's Halloween tale emerges, in hopes of mimicking the success it brought not long ago.

What's the verdict? Robbie K, here asking you to read on to find out his opinions.

LIKES:

Familiarity: When it comes to Madea, you don't expect much deviation

from the formula, a comforting factor indeed. Perry's writing doesn't try to be anything it's not, and that nets some respect in bringing the laughs that make so many laugh. And if you're a fan of this series, you'll have nothing to fear in regards to the comedy at hand (as evidenced by many people howling with laughter in my showing.)

Plenty of

Madea: Some Madea movies don't do give the mad lady her adequate screen time, choosing instead to go for a more drama (soap opera like) plot. Boo 2 is more than happy to give you a Madea fix, with much of the 100-minute run time staying on our "protagonist." She leads much of the banter, and her insults are more than enough to keep things engaging alongside her older colleagues. So, for a movie promising Madea, this film delivers on this aspect as well.

Fast Pace:

Another positive for Boo 2 is that the movie doesn't dawdle when it comes to getting to the laughs. A small, simplistic opening makes way to the comedy at hand, taking less than 20 minutes to get to the first bout of Madea running her mouth. Once that first joke flies, the movie continues at a steady pace and creating the effect of time flying (seriously had no idea an hour had passed). This leads to an entertaining environment that is simply fun on many levels, that's right no complicated thinking in this film.

Joe: By far the best part of the movie for me is Madea's brother Joe.

While his sexually harsh jokes, lack of respect for others, and intense focus on drugs are not my main source of humor, this character has some of the best comedic moments of the movie. His timing is well- executed, and his lines are just harsh enough to offset the bickering this movie holds within. The piece de resistance though, is how well Perry delivers that gruff edge in his humor to maximize the punch of the line and keep the laughs fresh. I found myself laughing the most with his scenes and was glad to see more Joe in this film.

DISLIKES:

Unoriginal: Familiarity is fun and entertaining, but it is also lacking

the original twist I like to see in the films. Every Madea film has a slight twist to it, but this film is too much a copy of the first Halloween movie that the tactics are fairly stale. Had it not been for the comedic timing at some parts of the movie, the bantering would have gotten much staler as the old folks complained about the same things consistently. This dislike also goes to the fact that Madea's jokes are losing favor with me, especially when they drop the morals for

incoherent babbling and arguing.

The College Kids: If you read my last Madea review, you know the college kids didn't impress me. Sadly, this movie managed to make me loathe these characters even more. Rather than giving the younger characters some admirable qualities, outside of superficial looks, Perry crafted them to be the same, shallow, annoying selves they were in the past, only much worse. The fraternity brother are even hornier, stupid meatheads with little contribution to the movie. Leah (Lexy Panterra) is reduced to a squabbling airhead, who does little, but flash off her own body with overacted gestures and a skin-tight leopard shirt. Yet, the worst character goes to Tiffany (Diamond White) the arrogant brat who supposedly learned her lesson last time. After all the punishing blows, the hotheaded teen hasn't learned a thing and has fallen back into the same annoying qualities I despised in the first film. What's even more pathetic, is that they don't use her selfishness very well to drive a moral filled plot, but just as a tool for more jokes. Sadly, this movie doesn't give the satisfying punch that its predecessor accomplished.

No story: Boo 2's other major dislike for me is that lack of a story.

It's true, the movie runs at a quick pace and is entertaining, but the trailers have tricked you into thinking there is a story. This particular Madea story is the lamest story of the bunch, with only a hair thin plot to ground the comedy too. Past this skeletal frame, the movie is only about cramming the most jokes into the run time, which also took away from the Madea formula.

The VERDICT:

Boo 2 is a sequel that accomplishes the goal of making you laugh with the same familiar tactics Perry has capitalized on for the last decade. It's simple fun, fast paced humor will keep fans howling in delight, while also welcoming a new age in with its simplicity. Yet, I found this movie to be the weakest of the installments, particularly due to the unbalanced characters and lack of story to guide the mischief better. Safe to say this movie is meant for home viewing pleasure where you can enjoy the banter and insults with better snacks and bathroom privileges.

My scores:

Comedy/Horror: 7.0 Movie Overall: 5.0

Rating: 42

6

Content: 42 , Size: 401

While the first. Madea boo offered a decent amount of laughs but I found the sequel to be somewhat lacking, while the movie features the return of fan favorites Madea, Joe, Bam and Hattie Mae but it Felton like the similar tone of the first despite being the tenth Madea film. Brian's ex wife Deborah makes a return appearance since diary of a mad black woman, but played by a different actress.

Rating: 43

2

Content: 43 , Size: 636

I would have loved it if the prank was for real. How Madea would real act when scared for real.

What i didn't like : 1. Joe is too much and is no longer funny.

The teenager with her friend, were very boring.

The whole movie was disappointing.

The turn around of the ex wife was very not genuine. I would have loved to have seen more drama on that and also when Perry heard that his ex allowed the daughter to go for a party, i have loved Tyler not to be part of the prank and also Tyler not to let the daughter go easy. Bottom line drama was not there and the bit that was there was not interesting.

Rating: 44

1

Content: 44 , Size: 832

OK, when are people who think Madea is funny going to wake up and see this is just a bad story, writing, directing and acting all in one movie. I would have preferred to watch 10 hours straight of PBS, just so I can get back whatever brain cells were sucked out while having to sit through this debacle. It was not funny!! The actors were one dimensional. The jokes were either sexist or racist. The plot was stupid. Take my advice, stay away from Perry's movies. He has become one of the bloated, bad directors that Hollywood should be ashamed of and they should be ashamed for ever making these types of movies. With so many good choices in steaming, cable and other movies it is hard to believe people would go to this heap of a movie. By the way, the only reason we went is we got free passes and it was still a rip off!!

Rating: 45

3

Content: 45 , Size: 314

Concur with other reviewers! Definitely not worth paying full price for. If it wasn't Tyler Perry, I would believe it was just a money grab?? Oddly, my family and many of the audience laughed a lot but not his best work and not half as funny as original. Even Hattie couldn't save this one, sniff sniff

Rating: 46

2

Content: 46 , Size: 400

This was not his best, even earlier ones, Father's straying to profanity and vulgar, adults left early and families with kids met us in the lobby. Tone it down and balance the racial references. Disappointed at this one. Maby this was the one too many with same line,

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

two new characters added did not fit. Fresh dialog and tone down Father. Summary, We will still support he and his characters.

Rating: 47

5

Content: 47 , Size: 2056

So as far as sequels go, this is a very typical one. I went to see Boo 2 because though Tyler Perry movies are not really my thing, I actually enjoyed the first Boo, so I took the chance that I would enjoy the second one.

I totally did, too. It's not as good as the original. As much as I found the original funny, it also had an attempt to show family values in it that was not lost on me. This time around their attempt (If there was one cause I did not see it) was literally taken out to make more room for laughs. In a lot of ways it made the film like the second episode of one of Perry's shows (Which I like more than his movies), as it seems nobody learned the lesson from the first Madea Halloween.

Case in point, like the original, Boo 2 is about Joe trying to discipline his entitled daughter, Tiffany. Once again she defies her overbearing father's wishes in order to go to a party at midnight in the woods at a camp where a bunch of people got murdered. Now I understand the natural urge for a teenager not to want to listen to her dad, but when your aunt is someone like Madea, you would think you would think twice about this woman coming to track you down, especially after what happen in the last movie.

Like the last film, Boo 2 focuses on Madea and her friends running into terror and danger while trying to get to Tiffany. The film likes to Parody current themes in horror like with influences of Korean horror and it also pokes a nod to old school Horror with the film taking place at a camp and the underage teens being hunted by a man with a mask and a chainsaw.

Overall, I much prefer the more light hearted Tyler Perry movies. Sometimes his stuff can be too over dramatic for me, but I seem to like it when he goes for straight up Sitcom style on us and that's Boo 2!

It's crazy and filled with laughs and no matter where it fails compare to the first one, we are there to laugh and that's what makes this sequel enjoyable.

<http://cinemagardens.com/?p=1756>

Rating: 48

1

Content: 48 , Size: 1144

Firstest of all DA haters can just get shook off. #shakeemoff

Tyler Perry is both DA funniest man and woman simultaneously in dis film y'all.

I was luffing so hard i almost choked on mu popcorn yo but also dis movie is also Hakka scurry yo, Dem jump scares had me like "oh snap"

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

but Madea handled DAT stuff, yo go girl and den also you give it up to
DA jay man in the sky #blessesed

i hope they make 8 mo sequels because dis
was tight.

Mr.Perry this is the fan base you appeal to, At very least this is what
you imagine the mindset of your audience to be.

Your films are modern day
minstrel shows and as Madea you personify
every negative stereotype that exists in black culture. Nothing about
what you do or say is even remotely funny.

I wonder on occasion if through
the piles of cash and the turbid veil
of Hollywood, If you take the time to look at yourself in the mirror
before you inevitably shuck and jive your way through another film.

Rating: 49

3

Content: 49 , Size: 3596

Let me just say that for the record, I'm not a Madea fan, I am just a
casual moviegoer. But that doesn't mean I can't get enjoyment out of
these movies.

Last year, I saw Boo! A Madea Halloween. I thought it was okay.
Sure,
some of the comedy scenes dragged on and on and there were some stupid
moments, but I overall thought it was an alright movie. I thought it
was way better than the other comedy I saw that year, Why Him.

But one year
later, we get this movie. Hoo boy.

Now, when I heard that they were making
ANOTHER Madea Halloween movie
one year after they already did one, I thought to myself, "Why? Didn't
they just do one?" But then, I was like, "Whatever. Maybe something new
is in store."

When I heard the plot of this movie, I thought it sounded
like the
laziest sequel ever.

When I saw the movie, I was right.

I did not
enjoy this film. The plot was the SAME EXACT THING as the
last film. (Spoiler alert) That teenage girl goes to yet ANOTHER party
with those frat guys, somehow not learning her lesson from last time,
and surprise surprise, something supernatural happens. How lazy and
uninspired can you get? Oh, and if you weren't there for the first
Halloween movie, don't worry. The characters will be happy to mention
it constantly. And just like the last film, some scenes with Madea and
her friends talking drag. But it's shorter this time around. That's
good. Some parts of this movie were stale, like a lot of scenes
featured the same thing happening: Madea and the gang are in their car
and something jumps out at them and scares them. Rinse and repeat. A
lot of the characters got really annoying, especially Madea's brother,
Joe, who I swear, always had something to say whenever a sentence was
uttered. Further contributing to the film's laziness, the moral (if you
will) from Boo 1 was the same, but it was with the mom instead of the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

dad. It wasn't really built up like last time, it was just rushed. And speaking of the parents, you'd think that after the father learned his lesson in the predecessor, that he'd be getting back together with his ex wife or something. But nope. He's still divorced, and his ex wife hooked up with another bald dude. Oh, and do you wanna know the twist in this movie? Well, get this... The father was behind all the ghosts and demons scaring away the kids. Yep. Just like last time where the father had involvement with the fake arrest thing. Pitiful. Absolutely pitiful. And oh yeah, the film ends on somewhat of a cliffhanger, where (spoiler alert) it turns out that one of the creatures that haunted the kids was actually real. Oh, please don't do a Boo 3. I hope this was only a joke.

But through all the bad things this film had to offer, there were some

things that I liked. A diamond in the rough, if you will. But it's more like a diamond in the litter box. I liked the return of Yousef Ereka. He was funny in the last one and was quite funny in this one. Also, that scene where Madea is in the police station and sees herself on a "Wanted" poster was pretty funny. (How the cops don't recognize her is beyond me.) But that scene seemed to drag, as well. But those things could not save the movie.

Overall, this was a disappointment. It had little effort thrown into it and was basically a retread of the first Madea Halloween movie. I do not recommend it... Unless you're a hardcore Madea fan and need to see everything that this character is in.

Rating: 50

10

Content: 50 , Size: 757

(sent from my Iphone3) Good day Madea fans! I am writing this review from my seat in the theater, having just watched B002 3 times. Let me say this, this movie is a keeper! Don't let those snoozy reviews throw you off! You have to see this movie! From the opening credits to the last sound, this movie will keep you on edge. That Madea cat is something else and I have to say, my B002 Tshirt, just ordered from Amazon.com, is inbound as of yesterday! OK, back to the movie. B002 will keep you "howling" throughout, and if you are looking to be tricked? Have no "fear" as this movie is a treat! Get your popcorn, treat it with some hot sauce, and sit back and relax. You will not be disappointed. B002 is not a "Boo Hoo."

Rating: 51

5

Content: 51 , Size: 1243

. . . and not in any good way. It's as if Harvey Weinstein, Bill Cosby, and O.J. Simpson have gotten together to remake THE HUMAN CENTIPEDE.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Writer\Director\Boom Operator Tyler Perry peppers BOO 2 with the N-Word as he mocks Transgendered Folks, Christians, Wiccans, and Family Values. Maybe his "Simmons Family" and their three generations of prostitutes is enough of a lame joke to carry ONE film, but certainly not 43. A typical sample gag from BOO 2 is Pops Brian Simmons encouraging his slutty daughter Tiffany--who's dressed so she'd fit right in on the cover of about half of Mr. Perry's 1980s VHS tape Porno Collection--to "dance" the "Peeing Dog at a Fire Hydrant," "The Sprinkler," and "The Toilet Seat." Mr. Perry needs to realize that for every Human Action, Nature requires an Equal and Opposite Reaction. The Blue-Man Pict and Green Leprechaun Races offered THEIR versions of BOO 2 just before Humanity was compelled to eradicate them. (When's the last time that a Blue Dude or a Green Witch plopped down next to YOU at the theater? Think about it.) BOO 2 very well could become the provocation that brings a similar Fate Down Upon Perry's People!

Rating: 52

1

Content: 52 , Size: 1791

The 3D special effects for this movie were fantastic. The screenplay was so bad that it became a comedy, probably better than some comedies I have seen recently. Literally the audience was laughing out loud. All of the trite lines were there. But more disturbing was the not so cloaked attempt by Hollywood to get their message across:

1. The Democratic President is a hero. 2. HIs Secretary of State, a USA isolationist who wants to destroy American's enemies before they destroy us, is the bad guy. At least Ed Harris didn't try to look like Trump. 3. A self-driving car was the escape vehicle. 4. Global climate change is real and so bad (2019) that it could destroy the world. 5. The strong blond sexy female Secret Service agent could (and does) out do any man. Don't mess with her, she will shoot you dead. 6. Males need to bond more. They need to be soft and caring and their early boyhood competitiveness can destroy sibling relationships.. 7. An Iranian (by the flag on his uniform) is one of the villains, but in the end the Arabs of Dubai are saved. 8. A Mexican is the one who ultimately saves the overly masculine protagonist and the strong German female partner (Ach Du Lieber). The Mexican savior literally points to the flag on this sleeve at the end of the movie. 9. A precious precocious little girl looks forward to saving the future of the planet.

Not that I disagree with any of these principles necessarily but goodness. I haven't seen a propaganda movie like this in a LONG time. Based on the trailers, it obviously is supposed to appeal to males... so get them in the seats and let the sermons begin. Hollywood... please. All that money should have been given to the starving children around the world. Imagine how far it would go!

Rating: 53

8

Content: 53 , Size: 519

Wow, the critics went to town on this film didn't they.

Although this film wasn't close to perfect, it doesn't deserve such a low score.

My main negative critique was that the writing/screenplay was a little sloppy, although still very entertaining.

But either than that, the performances were decent, the cinematography/sfx well done and the directing was good.

An enjoyable film that I would see again maybe one more time, but certainly not deserving of such a low score.

Rating: 54

7

Content: 54 , Size: 656

This is an action-packed movie that will entertain you; and you will feel pretty okay about what you've just witnessed.

Very nice special effects. The storms were nicely done. CGI was convincing.

Why I think this works better than other "Natural Disaster" films is because they did not revolve the plot around the storms...the storms were just the vehicle of destruction used. It's more like a Live Free Or Die Hard conspiracy, but instead of hi-jacking the IoT, they are hi-jacking weather control satellites.

Good CGI, a fun movie.

7/10

*Had Bruce Willis been in it... would have made it an 8.5

Rating: 55

7

Content: 55 , Size: 1744

In Geostorm, Earth is beset by natural disasters. In facing adversity, mankind developed a satellite station to prevent these catastrophes. While people overcame this problem, another conflict arises when it becomes opportune to use the technology as a weapon for sole global domination.

The setting in which the story takes place, you can say, parallels our own at the present in which we are experiencing technological advancements which perks we use to solve our crises but also create further dilemma as countries individually vie to be the world superpower.

Going to see the movie, I wasn't expecting much for it because it seemed like a so-so movie that's probably been done before only re-released with a "semi different plot" under a different title. But I was surprised by how entertaining it is. There's the timeliness of its

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

subject, there's definitely humor (which is funny but I thought they somehow overdid with some of the dialogue) but this one has also dramatic scenes that would touch you. The pathos really got me emotionally involved with what the characters are experiencing. This aspect I really enjoyed.

The downside, I can still say that it seems a lot of it's contents were borrowed from/ inspired by previous natural disaster/sci-fi flicks such as Day After Tomorrow (look at one of its posters for instance), Armageddon, and Gravity to name a few. This might be a turnoff for moviegoers who are expecting originality and it will most likely be so but for me, I got over it and had myself a good time in the cinema. It is definitely not the best movie this year or ever but its up there with the good, entertaining ones I really enjoyed watching this year.

Rating: 56

10

Content: 56 , Size: 1490

When the network of satellites designed to control the global climate start to attack Earth, it's a race against the clock to uncover the real threat before a worldwide geostorm wipes out everything and everyone. Geostorm is one of those films that i didn't expect to go see on the Big Screen or even like in general. Unlike past disaster films this one is actually more grounded and more realistic in it's own way and it's not some volcano or an earthquake it's actually humans that pull the strings here. The acting is also impressive by everyone from Gerard Butler to Abbie Cornish to Andy Garcia and beyond. The cgi are top notch with a lot of impressive and beautiful shots of cities falling down or entire buildings and airplanes. It also goes a bit dramatic during the end and i gotta say it does touch you on those feelings, there's also comedy of course and although not every joke hits some of them are actually pretty great and even when it's slow a bit it picks right after especially the last 30 to 35 minutes are action packed, special effects nerdgasm. Thanks to an all star talented cast, impressive cgi and some heartfelt moments Geostorm is an action packed popcorn flick that some people will love and some others won't it depends on your own personal taste and if you like this kind of movies in general but if you enjoyed films such as 2012, Armageddon, Volcano, San Andreas and Dante's Peak you won't be disappointed.

Rating: 57

1

Content: 57 , Size: 1052

I don't know who keeps asking movies about natural disasters, but Independence Day: Resurgence, 2012, San Andreas, among others, proved that it's not a very good idea. But as long as the majority likes it, who am I to judge?

OK, let's begin. Gerard Butler plays a man who saves

our planet from natural problems, storms, cold winters, with the help of a space station, zZzZzZzZzZz.

Geostorm is so full of CGI, that at one point you start to get headaches and you'll never understand what's behind the desire of destroying the planet. It has something to do with the White House, I didn't catch the idea because I felt asleep for a short period of time.

If you want a film full of disasters that are also eye-candy, Geostorm is not the best idea. The movie is the same as other disaster flicks, nothing new. I believe the writer wrote the script in 2-3 days.

If you want something mindless, with a total waste of talent, full of clichés and loud sounds, Geostorm is the perfect choice.

Rating: 58

8

Content: 58 , Size: 583

I noted a few "rubbish" reviews, they seem to have been watching some other movie. This has a pretty good premise (with actually possible science), and some excellent action and effects. I felt I got my ticket's worth, no question.

I would have rated it higher but there is a bit of cheesy voice-over at the end and some slightly clichéd dialogue I wasn't in love with. still, those are minor flaws, and for somebody wanting a good weekend popcorn action movie, you will not be disappointed. plus Butler has a few great lines you will really enjoy.

Rating: 59

8

Content: 59 , Size: 639

I was pleasantly surprised how good this movie really is. I tend to like disaster movies so I may have given it extra stars than some. I gave it a strong 8 for the story line and the special effects. At times there were cheesy scenes but that is just the nature of the beast. Hollywood does it's best making these style movies as real as possible. Looking back at Volcano and Dante's Peak even those were done well for their time. It was nice to see Ed Harris and Andy Garcia in a movie too, seems like these guys take big breaks between movies. So without going on and on I recommend this movie for disaster buffs like myself.

Rating: 60

1

Content: 60 , Size: 467

I found this film to be very sleep worthy, in fact I had to check the plot afterwards as I kept dozing off. Very cheesy American human interest story about the relationship between two brothers was its

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

central theme. The sci-fi was badly thought out and made Gerry Anderson look like an expert. The highlight for me was when the baddie was revealed to be a disciple of Trump. I left the cinema muttering 'we should have invested more in renewable energy'.

Rating: 61

2

Content: 61 , Size: 575

I was really looking forward to see this movie after I saw trailer for it. Oh, how I was wrong. I can't remember when have I seen such a bad movie in every aspect of it. Stupid dialogues, bad acting, really shallow plot... And of course, how can we bypass politics from real life... In movie, several countries participate in making the technology for saving Earth, but no Russians, they are bad, they don't want to save planet where they live... Really... Puke... At least I've collected a lots of points on my Cinema bonus card, so I watched it for free...

Rating: 62

2

Content: 62 , Size: 2461

When the movie ended, the 8 year old behind me said, "Thats the end? Mom, they didn't show the Geostorm!" and I kid you not, he started to cry.

I can totally relate. We came to see destruction, that kid and I! To see a disaster film! But, frankly, the only disaster here is the script.

First of all, the whole first 45 minutes could have been skipped. Frankly, no one cares about Gerald Butler and his relationship with his brother. (That whole plot line plays out like a lack- luster tele-novela.) And Jim Sturgess is so bad, the less we see of him actually talking the better. (I spent the whole movie thinking how much better it would have been if Sturgess's role had been played by Zazie Beetz. Zazie Beetz as the sister in the white house. Zazie Beetz having an affair with Secret Service agent Abbie Cornish... Now that would have been interesting...)

This is how they SHOULD have done it: Start the movie with the Geostorm clock. Right off the bat: count down to destruction! Weather going crazy! Mayhem!

Gerry Butler arrives to fix it. A German lady helps but everything starts to blow up. Meanwhile, Zazie and Abbie are racing around with the president shooting bad guys!

65% of the planet is destroyed! (For real! Even the dog!) But our heroes still pull it off, even though Ed Harris turns out to be the really wicked bad guy. (Isn't it ALWAYS Ed Harris?)

But surprise! The traitor on the space station is not the French guy! It's the skinny English guy who needs a shower! Gerry finally gets to beat someone up. (But it does look like he's beating up a 14 year old.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Its kind of creepy, really.)

After killing the teen-aged brit and stopping the countdown at 1, Gerry and the German scientists are saved by a Space Mexican. (Literally the only good part of the movie is the Space Mexican.)

At no moment do we hear anything about Gerry's feelings. He is childless, so we are spared the horrible acting of the daughter. There is no whooshing, clunking or explosion sounds in the space scenes BECAUSE IT IS A VACUUM. There are some actual futuristic cars to go with all of the space shuttles and the fancy smart phones. Gerald Butler talks like a normal person and not guy in a bar in South Boston. (They could have named the movie "Southies in Space"!) Most importantly: THERE IS AN ACTUAL GEOSTORM!

No Geostorm. No movie. For real.

Rating: 63

2

Content: 63 , Size: 868

This was bad.... really bad! I am a big disaster movie fan and can sit through most things, but wow this was really boring.. the characters are shallow, predictable and the chemistry between them stilted and forced.

The special effects were OK, but you just didn't get any sense of the fear because there was no character that developed enough for you to fear for them.

I think a better movie would have been Gerard Butler developing the satellite system and saving the world from Global Warming in the first place.. at least that may have been believable.

I watched Geo Disaster on Syfy the other day and at the time was thinking that it would be a poor mans Geostorm.. but seriously it turned out to be the better of the two films.. that should tell you just how dreadful this film was. It only gets 2 because the special effects were OK.

Rating: 64

1

Content: 64 , Size: 700

THERE IS NO GEOSTORM! Only a family drama and bad acting, some nice CGI effects about tornados at Asia, tsunami on Dubai (shit), cool climate changes at Rio de Janeiro (who are those people there? they don't look Brazilians), a lovely drama about a couple working at government, the conspiracy government that is not fault of the great president of that great united states of America (terrorists are always from other countries).

Tell me why the guy is so invincible? He goes to space, explodes a big station, and can survive everything! But he is a bad father to his daughter... oh no! If someone liked this movie and gave it some good 10 score, of course he was paid for it! No way!

Rating: 65

2

Content: 65 , Size: 1405

I went to see Geostorm because it was the only movie playing on a night where I really wanted to go to the 4D-cinema. Since it was a disaster movie I figured it would go well with the big screen and the 4D-effects.

Right from start I felt that something was off. The dialogue and over all atmosphere felt tacky and the acting didn't seem genuine. This was only the beginning though.

Geostorm is filled with canned dialogue and clichés that will make you cringe. Most of the actors under perform and there's no real chemistry between the main actors.

During the whole movie you feel like you're watching a movie that you've already seen and the tropes used are so in-your-face that you almost feel provoked.

I was thinking about leaving several times during the movie but since I was with friends I decided to stay. During the climax of the movie several people in the audience were loudly mocking the movie and laughing at the absurdity of it all.

Everything about Geostorm was a disaster. It was very predictable and preachy and the director actually made you feel dumb throughout most of the movie. The only OK thing was the CGI but even that felt re-used and tired.

Nobody should watch this movie. It's utterly bad and should be avoided at any cost. I don't even want to think about how much money was spent on this garbage

Rating: 66

1

Content: 66 , Size: 449

Hollywood is officially DEAD! They have run out of ideas and keep recycling the same trash over and over all the while shoving their far-left liberal politics down the throats of a fed-up public whose beginning to wake up. This sorry piece of CGI crap with a terrible script and actors who seemed like they phoned their performances in is what Hollywood calls entertainment to the masses nowadays. Don't waste your money or time on this turkey.

Rating: 67

8

Content: 67 , Size: 594

Probably because of the weak marketing campaign, I'm not hear much of Geostrom, and I watched it last night with low expectation.

And Woow!!! I

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

did not expect to see it coming. It was so Good!! The Weather technology used in this movie are very detailed. I love how Geostorm makes this sci-fi movie into a thrill mystery. I love to see the chemistry between Jim Sturgess and Abbie Cornish. The only lacking here is the development between Jim Sturgess and Gerard Butler character.

While waiting for the big movie at the end of the year, Geostorm is definitely must watch.

Rating: 68

9

Content: 68 , Size: 447

I went for this movie since my wife likes watching movies with this theme. The Day after tomorrow or Apocalypse themed movies where nature is destroying everything. This movie surprisingly had more to offer. It has a fantastic suspenseful plot. The two main protagonists Gerard Butler and Jim Strugess are brothers. They have fantastic chemistry and the story unfolds brilliantly. The special effects are awe-inspiring. A great effort. Loved it.

Rating: 69

6

Content: 69 , Size: 1198

Plot Spoiler review? Extreme weather is killing the planet. Satellites around the globe are equipped to control the weather by shooting little pellets. It is controlled by a space station with the system designed by Jake Lawson (Gerald Butler). When the space station malfunctions, causing sharknados or something, only Gerald Butler pretending to be Mel Gibson can save the world...with the help from his brother (Jim Sturgess) who he must reconnect with to make a good personal story. It is quickly discovered it is sabotage and there is a mystery as to who would do this...unless you have ever seen a Scooby-doo episode, then you have it figured out. Are you smarter than a fifth grader? The science aspect of science fiction lacked explanation as to how they were able to control air pressure with pellets or the gravity maker which nearly every space film has, but in reality is not feasible any time soon...which is why NASA isn't working on one. The science fiction is more fiction than science. The mystery aspect wasn't really a mystery so we are left with a passable thriller with some light moments, mostly provided by Adepero Oduye.

Guide: No swearing, sex or nudity.

Rating: 70

3

Content: 70 , Size: 251

Geostorm

fixating on the inner politics i.e. behind the stage was a wise

choice

rather than wasting the time with the vfx explosion which still doesn't mean that it's a promising movie as it contains lots of flaws and a poor writer.

Rating: 71

2

Content: 71 , Size: 2217

This movie is one of those lame Sci-Fi movies with one difference. Good actors and good CGI. But what the hell in the world was that script?! I don't know any movie that caught me literally sleeping in cinema.

Anyways, script was so cliché; that there was nothing unexpected there.

And this is story not about Armageddon or anything similar, this is a story of 2 brothers, who fight with each other and 'good' and ofc 'bad';

guys. There is also so much nonsense, people are using gasoline cars, but they are able to deploy millions of satellites and make net over whole damn earth.

Rockets are like deployed every day, multiple times, by not new tech,

but current rocket system, which is unbelievable stupid.

He is sitting in a rocket the same way like when you would go to

supermarket to buy groceries, just turn on and fly to the space.

And let's forget all these things, but the thing that HE BUILT THE NET

is most amazing stupidity in the movie.

There is one good, and one bad guy. Why people cannot be good and bad

at same time in this kind of cliché movies. The 'bad' guy is destroying

world intentionally. This can be compared to a guy who tries to open a packaged food can with a nuclear bomb. This is nothing.

I ignored even nonsense about instant weather changes, where people are

burning and out of sudden, just 2 meters away there is normal temperature and there is NO WIND. Whoever cooked the soup know that soup starts moving in all directions on temperature change, similar goes with the air. but, author of this script doesn't understand that.

With this budget he SHOULD KNOW that almost everyone knows the basics of physics. But let's forget even this.

The thing that during the movie you figure out the resolution of

conversation after 10-30 seconds, but conversation lasts for another 10 minutes. This made me so bored that I couldn't watch it. This killed, destroyed and vanished all my will to watch movie.

Terrible, very very stereotypical American, physics taken from some other universe and truly awful. Popcorns in cinema was best entertainment, and games on my phone.

Rating: 72

1

Content: 72 , Size: 1722

WARNING - CONTAINS PROGRESSIVE PROPAGANDA AND OTHER SPOILERS

I like disaster movies. I like good CGI when it serves a purpose. I like good acting and memorable characters. What I don't like is Leftist, Liberal Propaganda shoved in my face as not only as a plot element, but the entire movie script as well! I thought that this was supposed to be an entertaining Sci-Fi Disaster Flick. Here are the main points for you to consider: 1.) CAGW is not only real, but it will happen TOMORROW; 2.) Only Democrat Presidents are Good; 3.) Technology is so flawed, that any idiot can take it over for nefarious purposes; 4.) The World can Unite under the United Nations to produce Great Feats of Global Engineering; and 5.) CGI can bail out a Horrible Film. Frankly, I am getting so tired of Political Viewpoints infecting Sci-Fi and Action Films. If you want to do Political Propaganda Films, please make them International Thrillers or Dramas or something other than Blatantly Obvious, In Your Face, Left Wing Political statements. And if you want to do a Climate related Disaster Film, don't repeat the already used and absurd "Instant Mr. Freeze" effect that can't be performed without dumping a cryogenic fluid on someone or somehow causing an airplane to fall out of the sky by instantly freezing the aircraft without suddenly encasing it in a solid block of ice! Been there, Done that already. Now, if you want to use a form of EMP attack, at least it would be believable. Suffice it to say, that like many recent feature films that have been ruined by inserting political garbage as a major plot element, Geostorm should be avoided at all costs, unless you are a die hard Al Gore lunatic!

Rating: 73

7

Content: 73 , Size: 377

Geostorm is pretty much as good as a disaster film can get. The SFX & VFX are phenomenal, the acting is good, the story line is a bit silly, but most disaster movie plots are.

Geostorm isn't as good as Into The Storm, but is better than San Andreas.

This is a movie for the big screen, if you like disaster films then you should go and see Geostorm.

Rating: 74

9

Content: 74 , Size: 787

We've all seen such movies where mankind is facing certain destruction. Countless movie titles and countless resembling points. Seems all the available ideas have been taken and put to use, but it doesn't mean that a movie cannot be intriguing or thrilling.

Geostorm has the all-knows

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

scenario - series of events strike the Earth, lots of people die and bunch of heroes try their best to save them all.

But the story and action are very well made. It's dramatic, suspenseful, sometimes funny with some nice touches. The effects are good, well not like Avatar or The Avengers, but still realistic. I'd even say that the acting is very good.

Assets and flows, leave them behind, I find the movie really cool and I don't regret watching it.

Rating: 75

9

Content: 75 , Size: 701

This movie surprised the hell out of me and so did the rest of the audience(there was genuine applause at the end of the movie). Before watching I'd read some negative reviews, thankfully I ignored them and decided to watch it. The entire movie is directed well, despite the the difficult theme and message it delivers. I must say if it weren't for the beautiful flow to the movie and some good performances from the actors this would've flopped. I don't want to give you any hints which could be a spoiler alert, but there are two very important messages it delivers: 1) Do not mess with nature. 2) Regardless of race, religion, color etc, the planet and also the cosmos is one!

Rating: 76

10

Content: 76 , Size: 363

Critics are not fair once again. This movie was very good, I loved it. Gerard Butler nailed it and so did the men and women on his team. I was on the edge of my seat throughout the movie. There were some funny lines that the audience enjoyed too. There was drama, sadness, action. I will be seeing this one again. The story lines all blended together very well.

Rating: 77

4

Content: 77 , Size: 749

When you watch the trailer of "Geostorm";, you can easily get excited by the stunning VFX and ultra catastrophic incidents (Mega Tsunami, etc.). However, after watching the full movie, you realize that they have packed the trailer with all the action scenes, so expect nothing new at the theater. Unlike "2012";, this movie has a far less reasonable plot or intense scenes, the science behind it is also kind of a joke compared to similar titles. Unfortunately, it is one of those consumer movies where the protagonist arguably saves the world at the last second of a countdown. The movie ISN'T BAD though, it has a good

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

package of this and that, it just doesn't meet the fan high expectations following its propaganda.

Rating: 78

5

Content: 78 , Size: 998

I had been waiting for this movie since the first trailer I saw early in the year. I have to be honest in that I walked out before the end as I had seen it (a similar ending) 1000 times before in other movies. And I didn't care enough about the story or characters to stick around. The ending is just ridiculous in the same mold as Gravity and Passengers. I like Sci-Fi as much as anyone but not when it gets too impossible to even kind of believe it then I can't take it. I have to have some thread of reality to cling to.****Spoiler Alert**** At the end when the space station is disintegrating and millions of little parts are blasting all over the vicinity the 2 space walkers are just bouncing along hard into sharp type objects and somehow avoiding said millions of pieces of shrapnel any one of which would have ended their joyous space waltz forever.....couldn't take.....oh well....."He made a promise" gimme a break! other spfx were well done....not the end

Rating: 79

6

Content: 79 , Size: 1217

The idea behind this movie is good, but the realization is awful.

The movie failed because of the director, who appears to be pretty bad at being a director. He tried to create a good science fiction but ended up creating something that reminded me of the second part of Independence Day (which was an awful science fiction). Another thing that ruined this movie was the poorly written script, which was also written by this incompetent director.

However there are a few things that make this movie not that bad. They tried to get rid of the "The USA saves the world" cliché (they failed, but hey - at least they tried). The idea behind the movie was good and original. But as I already said the director and the bad acting of the actors (which is also the director's fault) ruined it.

This movie had the potential of becoming a great science fiction, such as Interstellar and The Martian but only if it was directed by a more talented person. Still I give this movie 6 out of 10, simply because the idea was original and managed to unite fiction and catastrophe into one. Too bad they failed to find a decent director, who will be able to make this idea into a masterpiece.

Rating: 80

10

Content: 80 , Size: 232

Best movie ever...

Brilliant 3D & 4D work....

Worth Watching a nice movie after long time...

The 3 D & 4 D effects are mind blowing.

I would strongly recommend every one to watch this movie...

Rating: 81

7

Content: 81 , Size: 836

After reading the reviews nearly passed on Geostorm but having enjoyed a few movies critics have panned and vice versa decided to brave the storm (sorry) and risk it. Despite some clunky script at times & stereotyping I settled down to a film i found not so much a disaster movie but more a race against time mystery/thriller. And in that light I quite enjoyed it.

The film is saved by some strong female characters (including Gerard's daughter who manages to convincingly resemble my own 12 year old - a mixture of plain speaking childhood vulnerability and strong common sense) plus a concept thats half believable, if hugely depressing (in light of recent weather disasters). The special effects are pretty good. Perhaps we r spoiled and have seen too many Days after Tomorrow and 2012s to appreciate them anymore.

Rating: 82

7

Content: 82 , Size: 1005

Just to get it out of the way the science on Geostorm is... not good. It reminds me of The Core or Armageddon. You just have to accept it and move on, I feel it unjust to judge the movie on something that they obviously put little emphasis on.

The basic idea is that is that thanks to global warming we needed a net of weather control satellites (literal a net, as in they are connected in space) to keep weather from being insanely bad. They start going bad and doing stuff like freezing an Afgan village, or cooking part of a city like a microwave. Two brothers try and find out what is going on a fix it. One goes to orbit the other stays on earth. It had two threads and many characters and used them well. It's a spy thriller with a large dose of a natural disaster movie thrown in. I could have done without the environmental message but it did not really get in the way, also the science was so ridicules that you could not really take it seriously.

www.JoshuaLawrencePike.com

Rating: 83

7

Content: 83 , Size: 374

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Predictable, but my mom likes this movie as she shed tears. I don't know why Max hates Jake so. Better if Max & Jake didn't have any issue before Jake was fired, then they're off over 5 years, until Dutch Boy went rogue. And Max, if it is Jim Sturgess's style, why is so rushy since beginning, he should have been a calm person, with neat haircut.

Rating: 84

6

Content: 84 , Size: 2976

Poorly Written Poorly Executed Poorly Acted Too many plot lines Very predictable
I went to see this film at the cinema with some friends to celebrate

the end of a term, and I found it shocking that the ADS were more enjoyable than the film. Of course, my friends and I talked through the ads, making fun of them, and that's what made them enjoyable. We also talked through the actual FILM, but we found that there was too much to talk about, because it was so boring, and we didn't want to disturb the audience, so we kept our traps shut. I regret that choice.
How the hell can all of these disaster movies be so bad; I mean there's Godzilla, San Andreas and this train wreck. The story is so bad, though it is an interesting idea; but we had the villain who was behind the whole scheme have no depth put into him so we, the audience can understand his motivations, and maybe even sympathize with him. But, no, we just have this character lazily thrown into the story at the last minute to create a form of a movie. His motivations hardly make sense, as well; I mean, he decides to blow everything up, including himself, so he can be President!??? Good plan, I hear you muttering, but it gets even better when the character (I'd rather not say) actually tells the "bland as tofu" heroes how to stop the 'geostorm' from happening!!! How the hell can I NOT complain about the writing, when it is THIS bad!??
My friend, who sat next to me, and I pretty much predicted what's going to happen as the story continued; "Oh, he's gonna get killed", "Oh, that guy's gonna escape". It even got so bad that when the villain was INTRODUCED, we guessed that he was the guy behind the 'geostorm' crap. And the clichés! So many clichés! They even used "the guy saves the day when the countdown reaches '1' cliché". Who uses that any more? Even "Alien" tricked the audience into believing they were doing that, and how did they trick the audience? Because that story can't be predicted like this one!
The acting of some people are horrendous; and there's one actress I have to mention because I haven't seen anything LIKE it. Telitha Eliana Bateman, is only like 11, right, so I can't bully her too much, but

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Jesus, who the hell cast her into this film AND make her narrate it? I seriously hope they got sacked, along with Telitha.

However, there is one tiny part I liked about the film, which doesn't even matter to be honest, and that is the CG, because it looks pretty nice. But as another reviewer, also on this movie, said: "They spent 50 million on the special effects budget, but only 10 dollars on the screenplay budget."

In Conclusion, this film is a boring mess that tries to be more than it bargains for and so just makes it ANOTHER Disastrous Disaster Movie

6/10

Rating: 85

10

Content: 85 , Size: 1498

Even before watching it, you already pretty much know what you're getting from this movie: scenes of big destruction & peril, cities crumbling, buildings toppling, and people running for their lives, etc. If that sounds fun, you will enjoy this movie. If you like other disaster movies like 2012, San Andreas, Day After Tomorrow, etc., you'll probably like this one. If you wanna be a snob and complain about writing or dialogue or whatever... well, what did you ever expect from a movie like this anyway? Just sit back and enjoy the disasters and explosions and have fun and you'll have a good time.

It's a movie that does what it sets out to do, so it gets a 10/10 from me.

Interestingly though, there's also a space station disaster subplot that's a bigger proportion of the movie than you might expect. Gerard Butler actually spends the bulk majority of the movie in a malfunctioning/exploding sci-fi space station, which is nothing to complain about, because the space disaster scenes actually look super impressive. In fact, I think the space scenes were actually worth my IMAX 3D ticket more than the weather scenes.

Other things of note: I thought it was pretty funny that at one point Gerard Butler's American character randomly points out that he was actually born in the UK. It's like someone behind the camera realized that his American accent sounds kinda wobbly and wrote in that line as a clever way of excusing it.

Rating: 86

10

Content: 86 , Size: 1194

Going into the cinema with a friend we were both really looking forward to this movie, as soon as it ended I made sure I rated it 10 out of 10, he looked at me and thought I was crazy. I looked at him and told him that it was better than 2012, movies like this according to him need to have more action in them, I disagreed. I believe this movie had all the elements necessary for a great movie, the highlight for me was the screenplay, the dialogue and the acting which were all tremendous.

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Every character played his/her part well and with real emotion. I was not in any way disappointed, I went to see a movie that I had a great expectations about and I walked out of the cinema feeling very satisfied. All these negative reviews am I seeing for this movie don't make sense, I think that we need to focus more on the individual elements that make up movies, not just looking at the movie as a whole. I would not have made any changes to the script or any of the parts, it was visually engaging for the majority of the time and I would recommend it to anyone who not only likes a bit of action but some light hearted moments as well. Definitely would see this again, no doubt about it.

Rating: 87

10

Content: 87 , Size: 2403

Tesla Tesla Tesla

This movie has Elon Musk written all over it.

It's about a space engineer trying to fix a weather-controlling satellite before a massive disaster, the Geostorm, with a pretty big budget, and a great cast, including the well-known guys like Gerald Butler, Ed Harris and Andy Garcia, it succeed to deliver. Ultimately, Geostorm is a solid enough movie, with good directing, great music, good acting, and possibly one of the craziest disaster movies out there.

Gerald Butler is great as the troubled Jake. The crew of the ISS is also great, particularly Alexandra Maria Lara as Commander Ute, Eugenio Derbez as Hernandez, and Amr Waked (who I at first thought it's Antonio Banderas) as Dussette. Ed Harris is amazing as Leonard Dekkom, and Andy Garcia is also very good as President Palma. Jim Sturgess as Max, however is wooden at times, so does Abbie Cornish as Secret Service agent Sarah Wilson, although she did got some bad ass moments which is great.

The movie pushed the boundaries of believability, and presents us with probably one of the most craziest, over-the-top doomsday scenario ever put on film. Frozen on the Afghanistan desert, extreme heat on Hong Kong, and massive tsunami in Dubai is just one of the examples of how over-the-top, but still enjoyable film. It's a solid mark on Devlin's directorial work, and we can expect to see him directing again soon. The story's focus about climate change actually helps in adding tension and kept us imagining what happened if these disasters happened in real life. The humor is also well executed, and worked, especially those who seems to came straight outta a meme("Marry Her! - the president). The editing is also, very well done. Intense scenes felt very intense. Action scenes felt very exciting, and emotional scenes felt very impactful. They also tried at concealing the plot twist in the movie, and they did very well. The cinematography is good, and the music is also, very good, another remarkable work by Lorne Balfe. What does surprise me is it's political subplot, which actually, a great idea (but leads to one of my gripes with this movie).

Geostorm is insanity at it's finest. The over-the-top plot, along with

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

great cast, good performance and an all-out spectacle of destruction makes it a enjoyable ride from start to finish.

Rating: 88

7

Content: 88 , Size: 1694

I saw a pre-screening of Happy Death Day and let me tell you, it was one of the most fun theater experiences I've had. The movie doesn't take itself too seriously, which is definitely for the best. If anyone walks into a movie about a sorority girl living the same day over and over and being killed over and over and expects it to be some genre-defying horror perfection, that's on them.

However, that doesn't mean this is a bad movie by any means. Jessica Rothe as Tree Gelbman and Israel Broussard as Carter Davis are fantastic as the two leads. They have excellent chemistry and make us root for them. Rothe's character wasn't the typical horror movie sorority girl, either. She was cunning and badass. She made us believe she could actually figure this mess out. If you don't change your mind on who the killer is at least twice throughout the film, you aren't paying attention.

There are curveballs thrown left and right, which made my theater gasp and yell numerous times. You think the movie is about to end on at least two different occasions. The script is smart, there's horror, there's comedy, there's drama. Happy Death Day takes you in numerous directions, while also making sure you have fun along the way. This is definitely one of my all-time favorite campy horror flicks out there. It even pokes fun at Groundhog Day, which it very clearly took some inspiration from. I recommend this to anyone who enjoys horror; again, it doesn't redefine the genre and there are definitely an abundance of clichés. With that, though, there are still a handful of clever moments I certainly was not expecting.

Rating: 89

8

Content: 89 , Size: 1533

When I saw the trailer for this movie I admit I rolled my eyes and groaned that they were trotting out the circular time gimmick again. It was of course classic in Groundhog Day, but never seemed to click since then. I was dubious, but after seeing it with my own eyes, I can say I had a great time. I'm not sure if Blum House intended it to be funny, but it had a lot of humor in it, enough I would say to qualify it as a dark comedy. The cast was superb and while it didn't offer anything groundbreaking in terms of murders/deaths, I didn't mind because the story was so well connected and it really had me guessing right up until the end. Another litmus test for the quality of this movie is that the audience was rather quiet during the presentation. I've been

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

to enough of these films to know that when you get a young audience seated in the dark and the film is a snooze, they'll start to talk and whisper and just annoy the Hell out of you. This movie managed to hold the attention of the entire audience and in this day and age I must say, that is an achievement in and of itself. I wasn't prepared to enjoy Happy Death Day as much as I did, but even I can admit when I was wrong. It worked from start to finish. I wasn't aware that Scott Lobdell wrote the script, but when I saw his name in the credits, I realized another reason I enjoyed it. I am familiar with his writing in the comic book industry and he is one of the more notable scribes. It's good to see the skills transfer.

Rating: 90

8

Content: 90 , Size: 1245

I think people going to see this movie are expecting wayyyy too much from a slasher movie. I'm rating it based on what I expected, and I was certainly impressed. This movie wasn't trying to be anything more than another murder movie, but what made me want to see it was the idea of taking Groundhog Day (which it fully admitted to ripping the idea from) and turning it into a slasher film. I was actually surprised it held back on gore and blood. I was fully expecting it to be all the tropes of gross-out killings, but it was instead focused more on character development and the story. I admit the characters are a bit one-dimensional, but again, it's a slasher movie. It's trying to win any academy awards here. In many ways I think it's parodying those one-dimensional characters of college trope characters and the "last girl" in horror movies because it goes all-in on establishing the main characters as somebody you're meant to hate at first. The ending genuinely took me in a direction I didn't anticipate, and then it took me back to what I was expecting, but did it in a way that I felt fresh. All in all, I had fun watching this movie, which I think what this movie was meant to be: Fun.

Rating: 91

10

Content: 91 , Size: 763

I went into Happy Death Day with low expectations, thinking it would be a fun yet cheesy horror movie. I was right about one thing: it's very, very fun. Now, don't let the frightening trailer fool you: this is a not a very scary movie. Yes, there are some tense moments, usually followed by a jump scare, and there was moderate PG-13 violence, but this movie succeeds more in its one-liners than its death sequences. There are tons of good jokes from Jessica Rothe, who is the best part of this movie by far. And there is a twist, it's not very memorable, but it's smart and well thought out, and it leads to a very satisfying

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

end fight scene. Despite the misleading marketing, Happy Death Day is an hilarious and entertaining horror/comedy.

Rating: 92

9

Content: 92 , Size: 684

This type of movie has been done many times before and rarely succeeds, but this one was a hit for me!

Jessica Rothe's performance is what kept me interested... she nailed her character and was convincing and funny as well.

I don't want to give too much away, but the twists towards the end were a nice surprise and earned a few extra points from me.

It's classified as a Horror, Mystery, Thriller but it's also a comedy as I found myself laughing a bunch of times.

Certainly a must-see entertaining film produced and executed very well, much better than many other films in this genre.

It's a well deserved 9/10 from me.

Rating: 93

10

Content: 93 , Size: 1646

I'm starting to see a trend develop in modern horror movies (the good ones at least) and I really like it. Film makers are beginning to realise that for horror to work there has to be some different levels to the film. 90 minutes of watching people get killed isn't going to be able to cut it anymore. You have to be able to make the audience laugh, think and even move them emotionally. If you can do that then your film will be a success. Earlier this year 'Get Out' pulled it off and now 'Happy Death Day' has nailed it too.

When the opening logos featured a joke (literally in the first few seconds of the film) I thought I may have misread the tone of the film in the trailers. Turns out I had, but in a good way. It wasn't an indication that the film was to be a laugh-fest, simply that it had that layer to it. And the thing about the layers that the film possesses is that every one of them works. Whatever it tries to pull off it manages.

The twists and turns and how crafty it is about concealing them truly blew me away. At least three times I thought to myself such and such element would be better if they'd done so and so, only to later find out they did indeed have that up their sleeve the whole time. The film is incredibly smart.

I can't say enough good things about this film. The trailers won't give a fair indication to people of what this film is truly capable of, and so sadly I fear many who would love it will not get around to seeing it. If you get the chance though please do see it. It's a fantastic film and you won't be disappointed.

Rating: 94

7

Content: 94 , Size: 1875

The trailer for this film accompanied by 50 Cent's "In Da Club" looked incredibly dumb, but that didn't mean that the film wasn't going to be a stupid good time. These types of repetition of a certain day films are somewhat popular with recent incarnations being completely forgettable. Groundhog Day gets it right, and I was curious to see a college slasher drama try to take a different spin on the idea.

The film is about Tree Gelbman, a typical short fused sorority girl who loves to party and get drunk and her trials against a day that keeps repeating. On her birthday she is murdered and the day keeps resetting until she can figure out who her killer is. The daily death takes a toll on her body and she gets physically weaker each time. its a tough task having to try to figure things out when everything around her resets and the killer and his/her motivations remain unknown.

Jessica Rothe was just perfect for this role. She's an attractive lead who played the college girl role to a tee. Her character grows by the end of the film and you start to feel a better connection with her as she becomes a different human being when her constant death teaches her about her own life. Other than that, there aren't really many fleshed out or identifiable characters, which is fine. This is a cheap thriller and should be treated as such, doesn't mean it isn't entertaining.

The repetition surprisingly doesn't overstay its welcome and keeps itself fun. This film is barely a horror because its so stupid and the film knows it. Its more of a comedy with killing than anything else. Which is perfectly fine. The killer reveal is kind of obvious despite the writers trying to twist you away from it. Overall, you won't have much of an impression from this picture but it makes for a good time in the cinema.

6.5/10

Rating: 95

7

Content: 95 , Size: 1461

Jessica Rothe is amusingly pithy and savvy playing a selfish college beauty, a spoiled sorority sister who rules the school until she is stabbed and killed on her way to a surprise birthday party by a masked lunatic. But fate plays this campus cutie an unusual hand once she discovers she's living her birthday over and over again, each time attempting to cheat death but always running into her attacker. Screenwriter Scott Lobdell isn't trying to sneak a slasher variant of 'Groundhog Day' passed us--he's upfront about the similarities, even exalts in them, while toying with all the possibilities such a scenario can offer. It takes Rothe three tries to fully comprehend what's happening to her; once she formulates a plan (creating a suspect list), Lobdell mixes things up, so that the movie rarely feels repetitive. Our heroine, snarky to start, follows Bill Murray's example and becomes a better person on her twisted journey (reestablishing contact with her father, apologizing to her roommate, even causing her own demise on one occasion to prevent the cute nerd from the boys' dorm from losing his life). Director Christopher B. Landon deserves credit for delivering a modern-day thriller with lots of action but no gore and no nudity. If it isn't quite a family-friendly slasher flick, it certainly is a squirrely, sassy one, with some big laughs counterbalancing the suspense. Good show! *** from ****

Rating: 96

10

Content: 96 , Size: 2101

The terror in Happy Death Day is the movie's comedy, as the point is to represent the compromise of eternity being allowed to experience censorship as a means to its existence.

Eternity is an impossible venture without origin. Origin is therefore something which isn't infinite, and for the sake of juxtaposition is destructive. The origin which is meant to hurt is the paradox of being meant to help eternity come to fruition.

Further juxtaposition, is that eternity itself becomes a force which isn't based around being for the sake of anything. Eternity is the end product of visual symmetry, but for the connection between eternity and visual symmetry to operate, the nature of the visual symmetry has to comprise nervousness. The internal state of conflict that defines the visual symmetry is the logic of the visual symmetry being its own self-supporter, even though eternity was never completely independent.

In Happy Death Day, visual symmetry is the end product, and the compromise of its status as an end product is that its composition is pointlessness and nervousness. In contrast, visual hierarchy sets the movie off, and the usual composition of visual hierarchy is assumption and objective. Theresa's story goes from visual hierarchy to visual symmetry, and the hierarchy elements are based around meeting objectives, while the equality elements are based around past events.

So in essence, Happy Death Day is the style of hierarchy being about future objectives, and equality being about the past as he contrast is the representation of the symbiotic relationship between eternity and its point of origin.

Of course, all of this makes Happy Death Day into a film which is excellent, inspiring and moving. Jessica Rothe is fantastic as Theresa Gelbman, and it's precisely her story that represents the complexity of loneliness being a virtuous concept. Happy Death Day is a much more intellectual movie than most other horror films - and most other comedies period.

By a long stretch, one of the best movies of 2017

Rating: 97

8

Content: 97 , Size: 2752

With Halloween coming up, I started taking a look at what Horror movies were being shown on the big screen. Finding Vincenzo Natali's Haunter (which has the same hook, but a darker tone) to be superb, I was excited to spot a film on the big screen with a similar set-up, which led to me joining in the Death Day.

The plot:

Waking up with a killer hangover on her birthday, Theresa Tree; Gelbman pushes fellow student Carter Davis to the side, and spends the entire day being grumpy to everyone, from binning a birthday cupcake her roommate Lori makes, to ignoring her dad's invitation to meet up (Tree's

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

late mum had the same birthday.) Going to a party later that night, Tree is stopped in her tracks by a masked stranger, who gets out a knife and kills her. Expecting to be dead, Tree instead finds herself re-living her birthday (where the same person kills her.) Caught in a time-loop, Tree starts trying to find out who the masked killer is, in order to stop her unhappy death day.

View on the film:

Setting the timer, the screenplay by X-Men Comic-Book writer Scott Lobdell spends the opening 15 minutes cheekily ribbing the clichés of the Slasher genre, via Davis being the well-meaning pretty boy, Tree being the popular, mean "it girl";, and Tree's entire clique being based

around showing the nerds who really is too cool for school. Catching Tree in a time loop, Lobdell gives the shiny Slash shocks sharp, underlying psychological terror, as each time she is murdered, leads to Tree getting increasingly raw fears that she will never escape the loop. Along with slicing up over a dozen, weapons- grade "Final Girl" battles, Lobdell takes an excellent stab at Horror-Comedy, that shines in each attempt Tree makes to survive the day, from Tree walking round the campus care-free and naked, to the headache Tree gets of having to re-live a deadly morning routine.

Perfectly stepping in time with Lobdell, director Christopher Landon & cinematographer Toby Oliver turn the Slasher Knife with an irresistible Pop-Rock atmosphere, of whip-pans around the campus, and neon lights over the killings that creates a party mood. Backed by a jumpy score from Bear McCreary and a great mask designed by "Ghostface" creator Tony Gardner, Landon gets into the Slasher groove with ultra-stylised tracking shots following Tree and the psycho, and overlapping slo-mo eyeing the wear and tear Tree experiences in the loop. The only one aware of what is happening, Jessica Rothe gives an excellent performance as Tree, whose sarcastic dry-wit Rothe hits with a real relish, that transforms into a tough, thoughtful confidence, as Tree wishes her killer a happy death day.

Rating: 98

7

Content: 98 , Size: 775

I had low expectations and I have to say they were totally exceeded .

This is an enjoyable Romantic Horror with more than a passing reference to GROUNDHOG DAY - and the occasional reminiscing of the 15 year old Shaun of the dead . Plus a bit of Scream , scary movie and a number of other slasher movies .

Jessica Roshe was brilliant in the starring role , you believe in her character , her charm was endearing and despite the 10 years between her character and actual age she played the combination of innocent romantic with a touch a modern feisty independent female in control of her own destiny .

The only poor point was how the inevitable twist was handled - that

could have been slightly better but definitely worth seeing .

Pad.A 7/10

Rating: 99

7

Content: 99 , Size: 2718

I was pretty excited to see this movie. I loved "Before I Fall" and I also love Horror/Thriller films....so seeing that "Happy Death Day" was a combination of both of those things, I decided that I should go see it.

I honestly thought this film was pretty decent....even though it wasn't quite as good as I wanted it to be.

The biggest problem was that this movie didn't scare me at all. I might have felt a little spooked just once...but that hardly the "OMG I so scared god!! Argh!!" type reaction that the movie wanted me to have. None of the scary/suspenseful scenes really got me. I feel like this happened because this movie tried to be two things at once. It tried to be a drama like "Before I Fall" while also trying to be scary like "Scream" yet only ends up being OK in both ends of the spectrum. It feels like "a jack of all trades master of none" situation.

The other problem was the exposition involving our heroine was poorly handled. Not spoil things...basically our protagonist actually has a backstory....but it is given so little substance and emotional weight that it was just meh. It also isn't as integrated into the story as well as it could have been. I feel that her backstory could have been more developed and/or given more emotional impact.

Despite these problems, I still enjoyed the film.

I liked the plot. Even though I never felt scared, the movie gave me more than enough interest for me to be invested in the story for the entire run time. It will most certainly keep you engaged. And I think the pay off to that story was pretty good, even if it felt a bit rushed in hindsight.

I also enjoyed the performances. Obviously none of them are going to be Oscar-winning material, but I think they did the job well enough that I felt immersed in what was going on. So good job guys!!

Another thing that I liked was that I didn't find myself cringing constantly like I do with other horror media like the "Scream TV show." Never once did I find myself rolling my eyes whenever someone open their mouth. Is the dialogue particularly memorable? Not really. But the fact that it wasn't a total cringe fest was certainly great news for me

Lastly, I thought the pacing was pretty decent. I did find it slow at times, but the story had enough going on that I never once felt bored or irritated or anything like that.

Overall, I found this movie to be reasonably enjoyable. Despite it's flaws, I found the story and the performances enjoyable enough that I can say that I had a good enough time. I give this film 3.5/5 stars.

Rating: 100

8

Content: 100 , Size: 501

This film is really one of a kind. It does a terrific job of evoking fear, as well as making you laugh out loud. The film itself is satirical in nature. It truly is a film everyone should go see, and is enjoyable for all ages. The film builds up well, and continues to succeed up until the end. The ending is very outrageous in nature, and seems to be a forced plot twist filled with ridiculous exposition. The ending will either leave you amused, or just disappointed. This film is worth it though!

Rating: 101

6

Content: 101 , Size: 1616

Happy Death Day comes from Blumhouse Productions, the studio made famous for the resurgence of horror in theaters (Get Out, The Purge, Insidious). However, this is the lightest of light thrills. Sure, it would fit in the slasher movie bin, but with its bubble gum aesthetics and goofy comedy, it's really more Freaky Friday than Friday the 13th. And in that sense, it's mildly charmingU if not bright enough to be great. For starters, the premise is pretty stupid, and the execution of that premise isn't much better. A brash and awful sorority girl is forced to relive the same birthday over and over, each one ending in her own murder by a masked killer. Imagine Groundhog Day or Edge of Tomorrow, but in the teen-screams genre and with a lot less complexity. In fact, most of its "originality" just comes in its blanket theft from other properties and throwing them all together: the youth world of Mean Girls; the comedy of "Scream Queens"; the protagonist from "The Good Place"; the scares from The Purge. It's not bad, just familiar, like we're reliving this recognizable movie just as the character relives her day. Once our girl starts trying to solve the whodunit-mystery, things get more assured and fun, as we find it easier to root for her and her insistence on not dying each day ad infinitum. Even though the deaths and scares are wanting, the other elements work, especially the humor and (gasp!) the heart. It's harmless and forgettable October fare, made more for people who hate horror than me. In other words, my wife will love it.

Rating: 102

1

Content: 102 , Size: 1262

Happy Death Day is one of the worst horror films of 2017. The cast is highly irritating, and just forgettable. Tree Gelbman yes you read that right, the main character is named Tree, played by Jessica Rothe. Her character is nothing that I even care for, just an ignorant girl from a rich family acting like she is better than anyone around her, her

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

sorority sisters are just as pathetic. So here we sit watching some over privileged character walk through the steps of a "Groundhog Day" style film, living her death over and over again, which was portrayed in the trailer.

Scott Lobdell was the writer for this terrible film, and in my opinion highly plagiarized from Groundhog Day, except this hack of a writer will not be sued because the story was tweaked enough and he turned it into a horror slasher style film, instead of a comedy.

If people want to pay money to see such drivel then by all means, go right ahead. There is no likable character, I wanted them all to die, and there is no point to see this film unless it's something to fall asleep to. That's it folks move along now nothing to see here. 6.7 is a fake rating made by this fake website and fake people. This is a big old zero people. Avoid at all costs.

Rating: 103

5

Content: 103 , Size: 1193

Comedy, horror drama. The heroine played by Jessica Rothe is murdered at the end of her birthday! The murderer is disguised by a 'baby face' mask, and she immediately wakes up at the beginning of the same day, over and over and over again. She now knows what will happen during the course of the repeating day and we then see her murdered again, each time in a different manner.

Every time she wakes we see that she has suffered some injury relevant to the murder, and these accumulate over the passing days. Her urgent need is to slowly piece together the evidence in the course of each repeating day until she can determine who the killer is. Every morning her frustration grows but at least she slowly progresses towards knowing who the killer is. Every morning we see her realise that reliving the same day gives her the opportunity to slowly learn how to be a better person.

Comparison with 'Ground Hog Day' and 'Edge of Tomorrow' are inevitable – GHD is even referenced at the end during a brief conversation.

Jessica Rothe's performance is the only thing stopping this feeling like a very low budget made for T.V. movie.

Rating: 104

8

Content: 104 , Size: 1645

If you get a strong sense of déjà vu watching Happy Death Day, that's because it takes the basic premise of Bill Murray classic Groundhog Day and adds a whole heap of familiar slasher clichés. But whilst undeniably derivative, the film still manages to be huge fun. At first one wonders whether it will succeed in offering anything beyond its high-concept mash-up premise, but as things progress it becomes clear

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

that we're in safe hands, writer Scott Lobdell delivering a clever and witty script with director Christopher Landon confidently handling the action so that repetition never seems boring.

Replacing Murray's obnoxious weatherman is attractive but self-obsessed sorority bitch Tree (Jessica Rothe) whose birthday brings an unexpected surprise;death;a psycho in a mask attacking her as she makes her way to a party. To Tree's horror, she is forced to relive the day again and again until she can work out the identity of her murderer and prevent herself from being killed. As in Groundhog Day, Tree is able to change the course of her repeated day with the knowledge she has gleaned, and ultimately becomes a much nicer person in the process. In the Andie MacDowell role is Israel Broussard as nice guy Carter Davis, who tries to help Tree with her terrible predicament.

Equal parts wry comedy and PG friendly horror, Happy Death Day isn't about to scare your socks off, but thanks to fine performances from a solid cast, some imaginative plot twists, and a snappy pace, it's still hugely entertaining stuff that should appeal to horror and non-horror fans alike.

Rating: 105

7

Content: 105 , Size: 621

I was pleasantly surprised by this film! I went in expecting it to be a repetitive storyline incorporating a mad man in a stereotypical doll mask. I can truthfully say it definitely surprised me! As seen in the previews, Tree is reliving her birthday over and over, trying to figure out the man behind the mask. While the movie is a thriller, it was really the surprising pop ups that get you. I really recommend this movie to anyone finding themselves wanting a fun movie that isn't only going to make you spill your popcorn, but also leave the theatre thinking about everything you just watched unfold on screen.

Rating: 106

6

Content: 106 , Size: 3712

Saw Happy Death Day as somebody who was fascinated by the concept, found the advertising interesting and good enough to warrant a view and who appreciates horror when done well. Seeing it just before Halloween as part of my Halloween celebrations, will admit to not being as bowled over by the film as would have liked but enjoying it a good deal.

As surprisingly interesting as the advertising was (and there has been some dreadful advertising this year, a notable recent example being the completely mis-marketed Geostorm), it is also misleading. One would expect a truly frightening film judging from the trailers, but actually Happy Death Day happened to be much more than what was indicated and wasn't what one would call terrifying or

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

sleep-with-the-light-on-for-a-week. The good news is that 'Happy Death Day' actually makes the most of its concept, refreshing having seen films recently that had concepts that they didn't do anywhere near enough with. The not so good news is that as enjoyable as it was it did feel like something was missing.

It is easy to see why lots of people will like, and have liked 'Happy

Death Day'. It is just as easy to see why it will be, and has been, a let-down for others. My opinion has shades of both, leaning towards the former. 'Happy Death Day' may be somewhat standard (while the concept is a pretty unique one, some of the story elements aren't), superficial (other than the lead character, the characters are developed very flimsily) and some parts don't make as much sense as they could and feel unfinished.

Was expecting more from the killer twist reveal, which is not as clever

and surprising as one would like and the whole ending felt rather silly and rushed to me (the killer's motive also came over as really trivial for an elaborate set-up). A little slow to begin with too, it's once the concept kicks in when 'Happy Death Day' properly comes to life and maintains that energy for the rest of the film.

For all those faults though, 'Happy Death Day' is also refreshingly

self-aware, almost very much aware of its standard-ness and superficiality and acknowledges it, and manages to be lots of fun, creepy-suspenseful and surprisingly thought-provoking. Gruesomely funny sums it up very well.

'Happy Death Day' is a long way from amateurish visually, the

photography is stylish rather than slapdash, the editing has suitably unnerving moments and the lighting is atmospheric. Christopher Landon never lets it get too heavy while not diluting the fun or scares, and the at times haunting and at others times funky soundtrack adds a lot.

When it comes to the script, 'Happy Death Day' is full of knowing humour and never removes its tongue from its cheek, instead keeping it firmly intact throughout which proved to come off really well. It also really makes one think. The story execution is not perfect, but it's never dull and has some neat twists and turns that stops it from being predictable and repetitive.

Jessica Rothe should become a bigger star after her excellent lead turn

here, she has been acting a few years before this but this is the first time where she really held my attention and allowed me to take proper notice of her. Israel Broussard is also very believable and the two have great chemistry together. The acting on the whole is solid but essentially it's all about Rothe and she is one of the main reasons why 'Happy Death Day' is worth a viewing.

Overall, a long way from perfect but quite enjoyable. 6/10 Bethany Cox

Rating: 107

7

Content: 107 , Size: 2685

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

I had a blast with this film and i absolutely loved it

Yes I know this concept has been done before; Groundhog Day, Source Code, Edge of Tomorrow and etc

BUT this film adds a new spin on the "s same day repeats until the mystery is solved" concept by taking it and merging it with a slasher film premise

Now this kind of film could easily go downhill if wrongly executed but Happy Death Day does a decent job of handling this concept

It has fun with it and pokes fun at it

The film is also a bit self aware of the clichés and tropes of the slasher genre so it's understandable when something a bit dumb happens

It wastes no time and you can easily breeze through the entire film without feeling any fatigue because every twist and turn in the film keeps it fresh and entertaining and keeps you on the edge of your seat, it's also of the right run time, just 1 hour 35 something minutes which felt right for this film

It's very well shot too surprisingly, I don't think I've seen any of Chris Landon(the director of this film)'s work before but he impressed me with this film

There is a lot of humor which adds to the film because the film doesn't take itself too seriously and doesn't take a very dark route even though it is still a horror film

It also has some cool scares and suspenseful moments, not too scary but that's fine by me because of the rest of the film kept me engaged

I have to mention the lead actress because my review would not be complete without mentioning her, Jessica Roth did a fantastic job as the lead girl in this film, her performance was so charismatic and its apparent that she enjoyed this role a lot because she delivered a better performance than i expected, A break out star performance and i hope to see her in more films now

And not just the performance, her character development in the film was simple but handled well, and combined with her performance, it made her character and her performance very likable

The mystery of the film is engaging although once it is revealed, you might criticize some parts of it but overall the film worked so little problems can be overlooked

The soundtrack is cool too, i looked for some of the songs after the film ended and i got hooked

It may not be a classic or a genre defining film but if you just want to forget your problems and have a fun time with maybe an easy to watch film, pick this up, Would be even better if you watch it in a group with maybe your friends, it'll be a good experience because Happy Death Day is very enjoyable

Rating: 108

6

Content: 108 , Size: 1903

The trailer for "Happy Death Day" doesn't do the actual movie justice,

something we see the other way around more often. I have to admit that partially because of this I was skeptical about it, only to be pleasantly surprised by the time the credits rolled. Don't get me wrong, in no way is this film supposed to be taken too seriously, yet I am glad that one is not forced to completely lower their standards to enjoy it.

Jessica Rothe's performance is great, even in the beginning of the movie where she is pretty much a total douche bag to everyone she somehow manages to come off quite charming and charismatic. And that's the thing about Happy Death Day; it's not necessarily a cinematic masterpiece, yet it has some kind of easy breezy charm to it which makes you curious.

The writers make the audience play a guessing game, more specifically

"who killed me?" by (quite cleverly) introducing all suspects on the first day. Then it's up to the audience to decide who is most likely, or better yet unlikely the killer. The answer was neither shocking nor predictable, that's the only thing that left me unimpressed. Instead of having that "omg no way" moment you will probably be more like "huh? wait? it was them?". The reveal of the killer to be confusing is a flaw that cannot be overlooked, because it is what the entire movie has led up to.

But other than that Happy Death Day was an entertaining watch, I would especially love to see more from Jessica Rothe. In a way the story line feels like a homage to the oh-so lovable classics it has drawn inspiration from. I guess that's reason enough to go and check it out. Be sure not to go into it too critically tough, it's hard to take a movie serious when the ones poking most fun at it (in an innocent way) are the creators themselves.

Rating: 109

7

Content: 109 , Size: 3238

Although the core narrative is not original by any stretch, there are good reasons for liking this lightweight foray into the slasher genre. There are some original elements incorporated into the hoary old Groundhog Day chestnut – just enough dusting and polishing to make you forgive the pillaging. It doesn't aim for the same conceptual depth of, say, Timecrimes (2007), Triangle (2009), The Butterfly Effect (2004) or Edge of Tomorrow (2014) but it does manage to incorporate a nifty murder mystery thread into the time-loop motif and the execution feels a deal fresher than it probably should.

Bratty, morally challenged and egocentric frat girl Tree (Jessica Rothe) finds herself living her birthday over and over again, each day ending with her murder at the hands of a masked stalker. All she has to do is find out the identity of her killer and avoid being killed in order to break the cycle. The film is not hard core or extreme in any

sense that might apply to the bulk of modern slasher flicks. There are no real scares, there is no excess of blood and guts, no explicit violence, no torture porn or gratuitous sexual activity or nudity. So what does it have going for it?

It's engaging, mildly funny in places and generally quite likable.

Jessica Rothe is winningly cute in the lead. And not in a painfully forced or superficial way. Her gradual transition from selfish and self-absorbed sorority bitch to a more enlightened and humane persona is skilfully handled. You start out thinking she pretty much deserves her fate and then end up rooting for her to succeed. Rothe plays it just right and you can't help liking her. She is one of the most rounded and sympathetic female leads in a slasher movie since Jamie Lee Curtis in Carpenter's original Halloween (1978). In fairness, most of the cast deliver in terms of injecting some level of believability and personality into their rather clichéd stock characters.

HDD deserves credit for some stylish camera-work and editing – both of which are tight, smart and in some places strikingly unusual. The key emphasis is on taking a well-worn concept, playing around with it and having fun. And that's what you've got here, a fun genre piece that doesn't take itself seriously and entertains for the running time. Unlike *Scream* it doesn't lose itself in self-reverential satire and admiration for its own cleverness in ragging on genre tropes, and is all the better for it.

It doesn't do anything ground-breaking or jolting, won't set the world on fire, and anyone expecting a visceral thrill-ride is more than likely to feel short-changed. But, I found it enjoyable enough, even though I'm far removed – very far removed – from its target audience. And I must add that I was wrong-footed by the ending, fully expecting the stock horror movie twist which isn't really a twist anymore – the one where you think everything's OK but suddenly evil triumphs. The twist this time around was a bit different to what I'd resigned myself to. And *Groundhog Day* does get a belated name check.

So all in all, not bad, just about happy enough.

Rating: 110

8

Content: 110 , Size: 679

Happy death day is one of those films that turns out to be miles better than what the trailer offers you to go watch it.

Plot is interesting Tree (Jessica rothe) wakes up and relives the same day by getting killed over and over again and has to figure out who is the killer to stop this endless cycle.

Groundhog Day meets *Scream*, now it may sound a bit crazy but Christopher Landon (director) pulls off a great film in the way it's been shot and put together.

With some great acting, light hearted humour and a mystery that will keep you guessing right till the end *Happy Death Day* is a great

horror/thriller and definitely one to watch this Halloween.

Rating: 111

5

Content: 111 , Size: 2603

Some friends invited me for a horror mystery thriller movie, so all fine by me.

But then, the film started.... This was no horror film. Most of the movie felt like American Pie having the naked scenes replaced with some serial killer slaying again and again the same person without any obvious reason(or any reason whatsoever as I realized in the end).

Anyway, the actors were not memorable. Their acting skills were okay. I guess they would seem as something more to a teenager and this is why I am amazed by the number of good reviews this film got. The plot moves along in a totally predictable manner. We see repeatedly the same day of a rich sorority girl waking up in the room of some guy who was kind enough to pick up her pieces after she got wasted the night before. Then she goes on her day and gets killed in slightly different manner every night. Then wakes up at the guys dorm again and everything starts happening again until she finally realizes that she is trapped in a triangle-like situation. The theme is one we know all too well,so nothing much to expect there(so much for the thriller and mystery). The protagonist tries to explore some ways of solving the "mystery" but drops them all really fast so we see pretty much more of the same with tiny variations,while she tries to act all scared and panicked. Each morning finds her more screamier than the one before and the in-the-mean-time- reactions make things a bit funny or cringy. Certainly not scary or thrilling.

The main problem with this movie is that it tries to pass itself as some horror,mystery film while it's a comedy- crime/light mystery, if it has to be called something. It's a total joke of a horror movie. And it would be amusing if it was advertised as such. You cringe,you laugh but you certainly don't feel any threat at any point. And that's understandable since you have little time to learn anything about any of the characters. What do we know? She dates and sleeps around,not surprising for a sorority girl. She gets scared when they try to kill her, but that's a normal reaction for any human being. After reliving the same thing over and over she decides to stop repeating her actions and explore other possibilities, so nothing really interesting here either.

In the end we had a movie with much more laughter than the amount justified for a horror film,no plot,not a deep mystery,in contrast to what we expected and no interesting characters. But we still managed to have some fun with this thrash dialogue film. Not really worth seeing.

Rating: 112

9

Content: 112 , Size: 1037

I thought this was just a cheap slasher movie version of groundhog day.

Oddly enough it was. Girl wakes up in a dorm room goes about her day then gets murdered before the day ends just to repeat the day again and again with her murder hiding they're identity behind a mask.

Here is the surprise though. This movie is actually good! The girl is the stereotypical bitchy (or witchy if they've censored the movie like they did over here) cheerleader. Pretty much every single person in her life has a reason to want her dead. This works as you go through the list of suspects (sometimes hilariously) and don't feel bad seeing her die over and over.

It more then earns the big reveal in the end and I found it to be a fun light hearted popcorn movie for Halloween.

This movie got one extra point for being bold enough to actually straight up say "hey, you know what your story reminds me off? Groundhog day, that movie with Bill Murray." right at the end before the closing credits.

Rating: 113

6

Content: 113 , Size: 5617

It was a fantastic coincidence this film came out close to when I was celebrating my 30th birthday, the trailer for this scary movie looked great, a cross between Groundhog Day and Scream, "Groundhog Slay" if you like, from Blumhouse Productions (Insidious, Whiplash, Get Out), so I was really looking forward to it. Basically Teresa "Tree" Gelbman (La La Land's Jessica Rothe) wakes up on her birthday, Monday 18th September, in the dorm room of classmate Carter Davis (Israel Broussard) following a heavy night of drinking. Tree leaves and spends the day being self-centered, dismissive and condescending to her fellow classmates and previous hook-ups, ignores calls from her father, throws away a cupcake made by her roommate Lori Spengler (Ruby Modine, Matthew's daughter), and is having an affair with her professor Gregory Butler (Charles Aitken). That night, Tree is heading to her "surprise" birthday party, when she is lured into a tunnel, there she is murdered by a hooded figure wearing a baby mask, the campus mascot. Tree wakes up in the morning, in the same dorm as before, and the previous day's events repeat, unnerved Tree relives the same day again, but avoids the tunnel. Instead she returns to the sorority house for her party, Tree enjoys herself and quickly hooks up with her classmate Nick Sims (Blaine Kern III), but the masked killer is there, he murders Nick, then kills her. Tree is terrified to find herself repeating events all over again, she is trapped in a time loop, she avoids her death this time by barricading herself in her room, but she is murdered again when the killer was hiding in the bathroom. During the next loop, Tree tells her story to Carter, he suggests she take advantage of the loop, make a list of all the suspects to figure out who is trying to kill her, she

spends the next few loops following suspected students, all of which end up with her murdered as she stalks the wrong person each time. Tree also takes advantage of her situation and enjoys the reactions of everyone seeing her walk around the campus completely naked. On the next loop, Tree passes out following her previous death, being bludgeoned by a baseball bat, she is taken to hospital where she finds she has retained damaged from her other murders. Then she finds herself chased by the killer again through the hospital, until she escapes in Butler's car, while driving at high speed she is pulled over by a police officer, she volunteers to be arrested to avoid being killed, however the killer shows up and blows her up with leaking gas and a match. Waking up in Carter's bedroom again, Tree convinces him of the predicament knowing a number of events before they happen, going to a restaurant, she admits she doesn't like who she's become, including being distant from her father, since the death of her mother three years ago, they shared the same birthday. Tree sees the local news broadcast report, that serial killer Joseph Tombs (Rob Mello) is being held in the hospital, she concludes he is the masked killer. Tree races to the hospital to warn of Tombs' escape, the killer breaks free and nearly kills her, Carter follows and ends up killed by Tombs, Tree is chased into the bell tower, realising Carter will remain dead if she doesn't restart the loop, she hangs her from the tower. During the next loop, Tree spends her time righting the various wrongs she has caused, ending her affair with Dr. Butler, and meeting her father David (Jason Bayle) to resolve their situation. That night, Tree prepares to stop Tombs, he has the upper hand, but uses the knowledge of a blackout to disarm him and shoot him to death, she relieved to finally be free, and celebrates her birthday in her room, eating Lori's cupcake. However, the next morning, Tree is horrified to be waking up on her birthday again, killing Tombs did not stop the time loop, she is distraught and returns to her room to run away. Lori is there to offer her the cupcake again, Tree realises she died in her sleep, she never consumed the cupcake before, she realises Lori is the real killer, the cupcake is poisoned, and had access to Tombs with her job in the hospital. Lori confesses that she was jealous of Dr. Butler having an interest in Tree, the two fight, Tree manages to stuff the cupcake into Lori's mouth, before kicking her out of the window, she falls to her death. Tree and Carter reflect on the day's events back at the restaurant, he offer her his room for the night, and comments that her situation is the movie Groundhog Day. Tree wakes up the next morning, she believes she is in another loop when the first few events repeat, but then Carter tells her it is Tuesday 19th September, he pranked her, she is mad for a moment, but then they relax and kiss. Also starring Rachel Matthews as Danielle Bouseman, Phi Vu as Ryan Phan, Laura Clifton as Stephanie Butler and Ramsey Anderson as Keith Lumbly. Rothe is well cast as the college student who has so many flaws that there are plenty of people who would want to kill her, the time loop format has been done before in various genres, thrillers like Source Code and sci-fi

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

like Edge of Tomorrow, this is one of the first in the scary movie category. It is not really that scary, it has the odd small jump and creepy element, but it is very witty, satirical with the campus setting, and making obvious jokes about its own slasher movie format, it is just an enjoyable popcorn movie and crowd pleaser, perfect if celebrating your birthday as well, a fun horror. Good!

Rating: 114

7

Content: 114 , Size: 985

What was so fun with the horror movies in the 90s was how they made people unlikable before giving us the joy of murdering them. The actress was incredible at being unbearable, I was excited to see her be killed... repeatedly.

I was disappointed by the lack of gore, but then I appreciated it as a clever suspense. And it sure delivered. She powerfully expressed her psychological distress.

It was very fun, movies that laugh at themselves are the best comedies.

It was actually deep and inspiring too about personal maturity and social interactions.

Seeing her relive the same day didn't feel repetitive, she doesn't just make different choices, her attitude becomes different too. I wasn't expecting much, but even when I do, I rarely get twists and endings this interesting. I'll gladly watch again!

I'm happy that more movies are using the Groundhog Day idea. Edge of Tomorrow was also interesting if you like science fiction.

Rating: 115

6

Content: 115 , Size: 2621

Happy Death Day Review By Jordan Whitten

Plot: A college student must relive the day of her murder over and over

again, in a loop that will end only when she discovers her killer's identity.

Although the concept and idea was a copy of Groundhog day, it turned

out to be a thrilling, mysterious and intense film with loads of drama and action. However, does that make it a good movie? I guess we'll find out more in this review of Happy Death Day.

The first thing I will say about this movie is that it is more funnier than scary. So if you're not a big fan of scary horror movies, there is literally nothing to be afraid of. You only encounter really 1 jump scare which is debatably scary, whether you are faint-hearted/timid person you would be quite frightened.

The movie Happy Death Day featured the main character Tree Gelbman

(Jessica Rothe) and secondary main characters: Carter Davis (Israel Broussard), Lori Spengler (Ruby Modine), and Gregory Butler (Charles

Aitken). Without a doubt the acting was great. Few errors were spotted throughout the whole motion picture. So no complaints there.

Other than that, the film felt like it was dragging on forever and it was never going to end. Considering it kept showing the same scenes over and over again which gradually got boring. Just when you think Tree might live to the next day, she doesn't, and that could really get you on your nerves and it frustrated me at one point in the movie. However, at the end of the movie when Tree finally discovered who her murderer is, I felt so relieved. After all the build up it all turned out to be quite useful in the end. It made the audience feel ecstatic. The film really keeps you guessing who the murderer is, I think it is an excellent movie in the mystery genre. I urged to discover who the killer was, I think it was it was killing me more than it was killing tree.

In conclusion, I personally think the movie is good, not great or amazing but just plain good. There were a couple faults I found in the movie, but there was also some really good things that happened in the film. It also shares some life lessons which is kinda neat. If you are going to see this motion picture, do not expect it to be a full on horror movie that will keep you on your feet. Although it does seem that away in the trailer, it's actually a really fun movie with Jessica Rothe saying a few funny jokes here and there. Happy Death Day is nothing that I expected it to be and I like that, hopefully you do too.

Personal Rating: 6.4/10 Is it worth watching: YES

Rating: 116

6

Content: 116 , Size: 4949

&x27;HAPPY DEATH DAY&x27; - 2017

Directed by Christopher B Landon{Scouts Guide to the Zombie Apocalypse}

Starring Jessica Rothe{La La Land} and Israel Broussard{Flipped}

Plot Overview: &x200B;When a young University student awakens in the dormitory of a complete stranger, she must move through her day until she inevitably gets killed off. The catch? She must relive this same fate ever day until she can stop the seemingly omnipotent and omnipresent killer.

Going into this film, I expected a low rent slasher with a silly premise that I could write of a garbage. Well it certainly wasn't that. I was pleasantly surprised with this movie. It's a very fun Halloween movie. Don't go into it expecting the next big thing in terms of horror, go in expecting a fun comedy with horror elements and I think that you'll enjoy this movie very much.

What can I say that I liked about this movie, specifically? Well the tone was excellent. At the start, very few of the jokes hit for me so I got a little bit worried. But as the film progressed, it became a genuinely good comedy. I tend to like Horror-Comedies because I don't like the feeling of being scared, and thus a joke or two helps calm me down. The way they blend the two genres in this movie is almost

effortless. It definitely leans a little more onto the comedy aspect than horror, which will definitely turn off those who EXPECTED this to be a horror movie. It's maybe a 1/4 horror movie, 3/4 comedy? The creepy and jumpy moments worked, but they were infrequent. With the exception of ONE, jump scares were also non-existent in this movie. Thank the lord God for that! But to be fair, the one that they DO use was pretty effective and worked well. So as a whole, the tone for this movie was pretty darn excellent.

Another aspect of this movie that absolutely deserves praise, is

Jessica Rothe's performance as a Tree. Sorry, the character's name is Tree; the character is unfortunately not a tree. She is, actually, far from it. Most horror movies just substitute in a stereotype of a character and expect that to work but this movie doesn't. She's the pretty girl but she's also the deluded, sociopath. Seriously! At the start of this movie, the character Tree is about as likable as the plant one. But Rothe portrayed this character undeniably well. Even in the latter half of the movie, she portrays the character exceptionally well and really sells the character's growth.

Another actor who appears in this movie was Israel Broussard. Broussard

also gives an excellent performance as Carter. Not only that, but I also REALLY buy the romance between Tree and Carter. It doesn't feel forced in the slightest and that is rare for a movie nowadays. It usually feels wrong when two characters get together in a movie because I just cannot see it happening in real life. But thankfully, I did buy their relationship, and found it to be a very fun and goofy one to watch.

Alas, I do definitely have some flaws with this movie. The final 15 minutes and the grand reveal were my two main issues. I won't spoil either of course, so you can still enjoy this film. But personally, I found the final 15 minutes of this movie to be COMPLETELY unnecessary. So much so that I was getting ready to leave at the climax of the scene before that because I thought the film was over. But no. They drag it on an extra 15 minutes and reveal what I predicted to happen. Which was my second issue. I predicted the ending BUT only because I was paying REALLY close attention to a scene and, while it may have been accidental, they reveal the ending by use of a prop. This may be just me being smart and interpreting it a weird way, or it may have been intentional, in which case then well done to those who were in charge of that. It was a very clever way to reveal it, and the people I saw this film with didn't catch on and I had to tell them about it afterwards. Despite that, I did figure it out so I can't really credit the reveal as being that good.

Something that personally didn't bother me but will bother other

people, is the fact that this is not a horror movie by definition. It has elements of horror movies, yes. But it is still technically a comedy movie, which is NOT what the trailers suggested at all. So I can completely understand if horror fans felt misled, therefore I do think that they should've either completely changed the marketing campaign OR included a LOT more horror elements and creepy scenes.

But aside from those

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

flaws, I found this to be a very enjoyable movie.

It isn't going to win any awards but I can see it gaining a cult following. It was certainly fun and entertaining and I will definitely recommend you go and see it. I'll rate Happy Death Day; 6
Creepy
Masks; out of 10!

Rating: 117

6

Content: 117 , Size: 782

The premise of this film is what gives it 4 of the 6 stars I have given. It's actually a really smart plot, yet it is executed rather poorly, which is such a shame considering that if the film took itself a little more seriously, it could genuinely be put into contention as one of the great Psychological Thrillers of recent years. That is the problem, it's more fun than thrilling.

The story and ingenuity start to slow down as the film goes on, with both gently coming to a halt by the final 10 minutes of the film, so it's a downward slope from (pretty much) the start but it does manage to cling on to its entertainment value long enough to be worth watching.

Don't expect a masterpiece, it's just a bit of fun.

Rating: 118

10

Content: 118 , Size: 657

If you've seen Groundhog Day and Before I fall, then you should roughly know what the movie is about. The story-line is superb for it is a comedy and horror and whodunit movie all rolled into one. This is Jessica Rothe's second movie that I have seen, the Tribe being the other one. Yes I have not seen La La Land, because I hate musicals. Suffice to say Rothe is one of those actors who play their roles very convincingly. I am glad the test audience reacted furiously to the original ending of the movie and the director opted for the alternative ending. I enjoyed it therefore I recommend it. A nice change to typical Halloween season movies!

Rating: 119

10

Content: 119 , Size: 470

This movie has to be my favorite movie so far. The movie has a really great meaning to it, it's just like Groundhog Day and Scream in one movie. This movie is scary, I loved the feel of the sound effects and stuff. The jump scares were great. After the movie I went home and I could not get to sleep, I actually woke up and thought it was the same day.

Overall the movie was the best movie I have ever seen yet.

If I

could only rate 11/10.....

Rating: 120

8

Content: 120 , Size: 360

Went to movie theater with low expectations, but this movie surprised me!

I would not classify this movie as Horror/Mystery/Thriller, but as a Comedy with horror elements - it was funny, i liked all characters and plot twists.

I would definitely recommend watching it – film was executed very well and kept me entertained the whole time!

Rating: 121

6

Content: 121 , Size: 1803

Happy Death Day is a movie about a university student who, on her birthday, manages to get killed by an unknown masked person. After the experience, she wakes up and realizes that she is reliving said day. While she is repeating this process, she decides to begin tracking down the person who is repeatedly slaughtering her.

Now going into this movie I didn't really expect that much. A horror movie such as this one simply looked like one where jumpscare would be very common. To an extent, I was right; there were a lot of jumpscare in this film and only a couple were effective. The first one, for instance was effective because you couldn't see it coming, but they stopped being effective directly afterwards because I had an idea where the plot was going to go with every repeated day. In a way, the movie fails at being a horror due to its predictability. This movie also has some major plot holes that I would discuss, but that would dive into spoiler territory.

As for the stuff that I enjoyed in the film, it does get entertaining sometimes and many of the jokes were pretty funny. The relationships between the main character, the love interest and the dad eventually began to grow on me. If there's one thing that the movie somewhat succeeds in as a horror, it's the fact that it does deal with some of the repercussions of fear and what it can do to one's body and that's kind of scary when you think about it.

Overall I really did enjoy this movie when it felt more like a dramedy. However, when it turns back into a horror film, for the most part Happy Death Day turns into an ineffective horror movie that is intended on using predictable jumpscare as a means to scare people, leaving that aspect of the films very weak.

6/10

Rating: 122

7

Content: 122 , Size: 995

Movie with the time loop concept is interesting but really need many good elements in it. It must contain good story, morale message, and also the brilliant plot twist is a must. And what makes this movie great ? Yeah it because Happy Death Day has all of the important element. Simple story with popular girl in university, with good directing, the repeated scene because of time loop doesn't seem boring. They can make the audience to be curious and sometimes with extra comedy it makes this film really great !

No doubt you will like this horror thriller movie because it is not similar like usual horror movie with some ghost, devil, or mysterious phenomenon. Its more like thriller movie with mysterious psychopath that kills you and you just cant escape from it. Even if I think this movie is brilliant, I admit that with this film concept like this, I like better if the movie genre is drama because it can offer you much more emotional, dramatic, and better morale message.

Rating: 123

6

Content: 123 , Size: 4352

Groundhog Day had an arrogant man trapped in a small town on the same day until he learned to appreciate those around him. Edge of Tomorrow had Tom Cruise repeating an alien invasion until he could figure a way to win it. Today's movie has someone repeating not just their birthday, but the day that they are killed by a psychopath. I've mentioned before that on paper, time loop stories are a great way to get to know the person suffering the consequence of reliving the day. On camera, the trick is harder as the story has to remain consistent without being too repetitive.

The idea of someone having to repeat their birthday is an interesting one, considering that the older one gets, the less they care about the day that celebrates that. It may be a morose notion, but it's about the college age in which people would rather draw attention on the celebration rather than the number factor. I myself celebrated my thirtieth by taking a vacation and having dinner with the family. The movie not only gives us a character who could care less that she has a birthday, but an extra layer that I won't give away. So Happy Death Day may have a little extra for the time loop story.

A snobbish college girl Theresa (played by Jessica Rothe) wakes up in the dorm room of fellow student Carter (played by Israel Broussard). Though he tries to make small talk, she leaves to go back to her sorority. She spends the day being rude and pretentious to everyone including her roommate Lori. She's also the other girl in an affair with her professor and even ignores her fathers invitation to a birthday lunch. On her way to a party, she is stalked by a hooded figure wearing her school's mascot image as a mask. She is killed;but wakes up the same morning;in the same dorm room of Carter.

She initially

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

dismisses the previous night as a dream and goes on her day again…only to get killed. When she realizes she's repeating the same day over and over, she's suggested to use that time to follow potential suspects. Each day ends in death and summons her back to the beginning, but the twist is that with each day, she is growing weaker from the injuries. So despite the safety of the time loop, there seems to be a clock that is getting closer to midnight as Theresa is trying to solve her murder.

The whole time loop formula has been done before, but I like how Happy

Death Day has used it in a horror context. Did it generate a scary movie? Well… I'd say that while it's shot in a suspenseful tone, it doesn't generate that many scares. I'd argue that the tone is not even full horror, but I'll get to that in a moment. But going back to it's use on the time loop, I think they did it well. I also like that they establish that her body is still vulnerable to damage from the murders, otherwise it would seem like there were no consequence.

I'll say that I really enjoyed Jessica Rothe in the lead. For someone who initially has to start the film in an unlikable manner, she carries the story and really makes you want to see her redeem herself.

What the marketing seems to hide is that Happy Death Day is a part comedy. While I'm no sure why the trailers didn't want to spoil that notion, but I laughed more then I thought I was going. Because the film is still trying to be scary, it does suffer from inconsistency. I think it would have made sense to try and be a little more funny, something in the vein of Evil Dead or Drag Me to Hell. That would at least justify the PG-13 rating that is hindering this story of it's full potential. Those hoping for a lot of blood are not going to see it. I'll also bet that the film war originally produced with an R rating, only to get cut down to try and get in a teenage audience. Come on! Teenagers are already aware of these kinds of college dangers. They would have been fine with an R rating.

I'll give this six red birthday candles out of ten. Happy Death Day feels like a great movie that was edited by cowards who thought they knew what was best. I doubt ill see this again as it is, but I'll be on the lookout for a directors cut. Maybe that'll add back in that extra violence and jokes that are apparently too much for the studio

Rating: 124

10

Content: 124 , Size: 5709

Denis Villeneuve, you magnificent world wonder, you did it again!

I have seen this film three times in the cinema, in 3D, 2D and 4DX.

And one of the things i have noticed with this film, is that it's not the time in the cinema that takes up my time, It's the hours upon hours in between spent thinking about the film, that is the real time consumer. This film left such a deep and profound impact, which i cannot escape. And I've gone back to the cinema twice to be

"tortured",
but it's worth it.

It's a dark, mysterious, grim, hopeless, sad and
lonely film, set in a
possible near future where the human race is hanging by their
fingertips on the edge of doom. So it's quite depressing. But it's so
brilliantly put together, the closest master of cinema i think of that
has done something similar, is Stanley Kubrick.

Many Stanley Kubrick films
were also "hated" by many when they first
released. "2001: A Space Odyssey" for example, which had gorgeous
visuals, but felt flat and hollow for many, even professional reviewers
back then. But what Kubrick did best with his films, was to create
afterthought. People left the cinema feeling confused and even
depressed, but the movies planted a seed which then grew for years. The
original Blade Runner also accomplished this. BR2049 is no exception,
this movie will without doubt live on to be interpreted, analyzed and
discussed for decades to come. The story continues from the original,
but stands completely on it's own, it tells a new story that directly
interlink with the original, but without trying to be a copy, it's a
natural continuation in the same universe. You don't have to see the
original Blade Runner first, though i do recommend it, see the final
cut.

BR2049 has some of the most gorgeous visuals i have ever seen, and the
cinematography is out of this world, there is literally no excuse not
to give Roger Deakins the Oscar this time. After 13 nominations he has
now knocked the ball out of the park and is this year in his own league
entirely. It's confusing to look at something so gorgeous, whilst
painting a picture of such a sad and lost world. It sort of collides
with your senses, your eyes say it's beautiful, your mind say it's
depressing. Which senses are you going to believe? What does it mean?
At least don't confuse feeling depressed as a sign that this movie is
bad, it's nothing wrong feeling depressed, take it in, embrace it. Then
you will know how it feels to be a replicant that's trapped in a caged
mind.

BR2049's story happens 30 years after the original, and there is
three
short films on Youtube i recommend you watch. These short films
describes some of what happened in between 2019 and 2049. Watching them
makes it slightly easier to understand some of the things going on. But
the underlying theme is the same as it was in the original. What does
it mean to be human? What does it mean to have memories? What is a
soul? And so on.

The world has gone darker in 2049, climate is spinning out
of control,
almost all animals and plants have died. People are desperate and lost,
law enforcement can barely keep anything together, and only a small
spark can set of total disaster, which is looming just around every
corner. Niander Wallace has taken over Tyrell Corp and has by the time
2049 takes place designed millions of obedient replicants that does
exactly what he tells them to do. But there is one thing Wallace has
not been able to perfect, and that's what the main story is all about,
and Wallace will do anything in his power to get his hands on the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

"technology";, which will result in him becoming many hundred times richer and more powerful, the sole ruler of the entire universe. He is so far gone in his mind by 2049 he actually believes he is god himself, and he calls his replicants angels.

And of course he also uses replicants to do his "dirty work";. In 2049 we meet his right hand "girl"; Luv (Brilliantly played by Sylvia Hoeks, if there is one actor in this movie that steal the show, it's her). Luv is a "handygirl"; so to speak, that perform whatever task she is set to do, with no remorse. Or is that entirely true? I can't spoil anything, but look closely at Luv's character arc. All the other actors also do an outstanding job in this film, no bad performances, but i can't talk about all of them due to the word limit in these reviews.

Be prepared going to see this film, it's depressing and heavy on your mind, and it demands your full attention. It's one of those rare films who dares to challenge the audience, and by doing so, taking a huge risk, and a 155 million dollar risk at that. The film isn't perfect, but it's close, and it shows the tremendous skills of Denis Villeneuve. And those few mistakes this movie have, are probably just happy little accidents as Rob Ross would have put it. This film is very much like a painting, every stroke of the brush matters, and every little detail is carefully crafted, it takes monumental skills to pull it off.

I loved this film, it's the best film I've seen all year, It is a must see, a monumental triumph of a film that's just as good (possibly even better) as the original and one of the best sequels of all time!

9.7/10 - Masterpiece

And BTW Villeneuve's next movie might be Dune, imagine if he brings Deakins and the rest of this team to make that movie. Yeah, I'm going to leave you with that thought. This is basically porn.

Rating: 125

10

Content: 125 , Size: 5405

Let me start by saying that I am a huge Denis Villeneuve fan and absolutely love every movie he made, from his breakthrough drama 'Incendies'; to the action thriller 'Sicario';. But when I learned that he was going to make a sequel to Ridley Scott's iconic Blade Runner I had mixed feelings. Would he be able to live up to the expectations and make a sequel that could measure itself with the original? For this reason, I went into the cinema thinking ''This will be a great movie, I am a Villeneuve fan so I have to like it''; but that was a mistake, for once I stopped expecting and just started experiencing the film, I was enchanted by all of its visual beauty. I was wrong to doubt Villeneuve; his 'Blade Runner 2049'; even succeeds in transcending in some ways the original masterpiece, especially as a visual experience.

The bleak dystopian future Scott so perfectly created is even more beautiful in Villeneuve's 2049, for which a lot of credit has to be

given to the brilliant director of photography Roger Deakins, who has made one of his best works (which says a lot). Every shot is brilliant, I loved every single frame and I cannot imagine that he wouldn't get nominated and win an Oscar for this phenomenal work. But also a big thumbs up has to be given to the entire effects team, for Deakins didn't do it all on his own.

Deakins isn't the only mastermind at work, for the score is also beautifully done. When I learned that composer J  hann J  hannsson (someone who has collaborated multiple times with Villeneuve and did most of the scores for his movies) got fired I was surprised; J  hannsson has always delivered great work, but according to Villeneuve, his score ''wasn't the right one'' for this movie for it didn't ''resemble Vangelis soundtrack for Blade Runner'' quite enough.

So he got replaced by probably the best man in the business nowadays; Hans Zimmer. And as we are used to with the German composer, this was once again sublime and a great homage to the original. Zimmer's 2049 score can be compared to his Dunkirk score, in a way that it unsettles us from the first chord and just as the Second World War movie, it keeps us on the edges of our seats, especially during the last hour.

As for the people who are actually situated in front of the camera, they all play their parts very well. I was especially happy that Ryan Gosling's agent K was indeed the leading man and he did a very good job. I was slightly concerned that it would mostly be about Harrison Ford's Deckard, but luckily that wasn't the case. Nevertheless, Ford gives one of his best performances in years and after all the iconic roles he played once again in recent years (Han Solo, Indiana Jones) this is by far the best. The smaller but important roles are also noteworthy; Robin Wright's Lieutenant Joshi makes a fierce and convincing police chief, while the villain duo Jared Leto's Neander Wallace as the evil head of a corporation at the top of the new world order and his frightening hit-woman Luv (Sylvia Hoeks) are also very impressive. Last but not least, Ana de Armas is also very good as Joi, K's girlfriend (even if she does remind me a lot of Scarlet Johansson in 'Her' and slightly of Alicia Vikander in 'Ex Machina', but maybe that's something Villeneuve did that on purpose and wanted to pay homage to these recent but also very good science-fiction movies).

That said, Villeneuve will receive most of the credit, as he should.

For unlike most of Hollywood's blockbusters nowadays, he doesn't simply deliver us a spectacle with some nice effects or a reboot of the original, but he picks up the threads where Scott left, which was a monumental task, for the original 'Blade Runner' is one of the most impressive and iconic movies ever made. 2049 continues on the same topics raised by the original, making the sequel worth the 35-year long wait; it goes further with what was proposed in the first installment, enriching one another. It is possible that one day a third installment

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

could be made, but that is only if any director will ever find the courage to make another 'Blade Runner'; for the bar is raised incredibly high. I believe that in time, 'Blade Runner 2049' will just as the original one, grow into a cult movie, and rightfully so, for it is its own movie, but, just as the original, a visually remarkable, achingly human sci-fi masterpiece.

I am not going to say more about it, because the studio has been unusually insistent in its pleas to critics and the first movie viewers not to reveal any plot points, but I am glad they did. Even if I could go on and on about the movie and the difference between replicants and humans (or is there really much of a difference, after all?) the less you know the better, because 2049 feels at its best when it surprises (which is one of Villeneuve's greatest strengths). This is a movie best experienced on the biggest screen in your cinema; trust me, it will be worth your while. As for me, I will most likely try and make some free time in my schedule for the coming days, 'cause I want to go the cinema again, guess what I'm gonna watch...

Rating: 126

10

Content: 126 , Size: 4039

For film fanatics like myself, Blade Runner 2049 is a great film for people to see, regardless if they've witnessed the original or not. On the other hand, if you've never seen the original Blade Runner and are just a casual moviegoer that have thought of the promotion for this film as being an action-packed thrill ride, then I'd have to warn to stay far away from this near three hour motion picture. It's very hard to review this film without getting into specific plot details, but that's exactly what makes this film worth the price of admission alone. For nearly every reason a film fan should be excited about a movie, here is why Blade Runner 2049 is a must see as soon as possible.

Before dropping you into this world with Ryan Gosling's character, there is text at the beginning that will fill you in on the history of the events in the past, but even though that information is given to you, your experience just won't be the same without having viewed the first film multiple times and remembering the emotional core of it. Set out on a mission to find something of meaning to the overall story, Ryan Gosling's character (who will remain nameless for the sake of this review) uncovers mysteries and secrets from the past, inevitably involving Rick Deckard. Quite honestly, that's the plot in a nutshell and the specifics of the film will lead to ruining your experience, so let's get technical.

If not for anything else, Blade Runner 2049 benefits from some of the best cinematography I've laid my eyes on in years. From the addition of the seamlessly blended visual effects, to the mind- blowing scenery constructed by the entire art department, I have nothing but praise for this film. Whether or not you find yourself enjoying your experience,

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

the visuals alone should have you applauding, due to their incredibly detailed nature. I personally found the overall film to be magnificent, but when certain scenes were dialogue-free and asking you to gasp at the imagery, that's exactly what I was doing, as I feel many audiences members will.

Again, without giving anything away, once Rick Deckard (Harrison Ford)

enters the picture, the way both films sort of interconnect was brilliant in my opinion. It does justice to any loose ends that fans may have wanted in the past, as well as create a new story to gawk at in the process. With a terrifically restrained performance by Ryan Gosling, you'll find yourself sucked into this world as a fly on the wall, as he uncovers these mysteries. With the addition of Harrison Ford giving one of his most sincere and memorable performances, as well as Ana de Armas in a role that really took me by surprise, this film was casted to the nines from beginning to end. Some may complain about Jared Leto and Dave Bautista not being included as much, but I felt as though they served the story quite nicely.

In the end, this movie aims to impress Sci-Fi fans across the world, but I feel as though the people who will be looking back on this as a possible classic or at least one of the best sequels ever made, are those who've had the pleasure of indulging in the greatness that is 1982's Blade Runner. I don't say this about films very often, especially when talking about sequels, but I haven't been this immersed in a theatrical experience in quite some time. This is definitely a superior film than the original, it's one of the best films of 2017, and I'll be revisiting it very soon. Blade Runner 2049 is getting a lot of praise and awards consideration from critics and filmgoers across the world, and every bit of it is deserved. Aside from being very long, this is pretty much a perfect film if you don't try to nitpick how it connects and certain questions that aren't blatantly answered. If you know what type of film you're in for, or you've at least seen the original and enjoyed it, I can't recommend this movie enough.

Rating: 127

10

Content: 127 , Size: 1599

Blade Runner 2049 is the sequel to the 1982 sci-fi classic Blade Runner. Directed by Denis Villeneuve (Arrival, Sicario) and once again based on Philip K. Dick's novel Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?, it successfully recaptures just about everything excellent about the original and is a superb sequel to one of the greatest and most important science fiction films of all time.

Thirty years after the events of the first film, LAPD Officer K (Ryan Gosling) works as a Blade Runner, retiring old rogue replicants (artificial humans) hiding out around the Los Angeles area. One day while on a job, K discovers a long buried secret in the yard of a replicant which leads him on a journey to track down former Blade

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Runner Rick Deckard (Harrison Ford), who has been missing for decades.

Featuring amazing visuals and some of the most philosophical and thought-provoking themes since the original, Blade Runner 2049 is a masterpiece of science fiction and is possibly one of the greatest sequels ever made. I was transfixed the entire time, to the point where I felt that even blinking would cause me to miss something I wanted to see. The cast was brilliant as well, especially Ryan Gosling, who does a fantastic job carrying the film as its lead actor. However, perhaps best of all, is that seeing the original is not a requirement to fully understand everything that is going on, although it would probably still help to have done so beforehand. I'm almost certain that author Philip K. Dick would be proud of this film. I know I am.

I rate it a very high 9.5/10

Rating: 128

3

Content: 128 , Size: 4762

I never was one of those people asking for a Blade Runner sequel. Now that Blade Runner 2049 is out, my position still stands. This film is simply a massive letdown and nothing more.

The year is 2049 and the world has grown in technology, but not humanity. Ryan Gosling plays K, a Blade Runner (a futuristic cop) tasked with tracking down the last of the Replicants-robots that look like humans. Knowing that he himself is a replicant, he goes on a journey of his own when he finds a box containing the bones of a Replicant who gave birth to a child and is tasked with finding the child. Little does he know that the new head of the Tyrell Corporation that makes the Replicants, Mr. Wallace (Jared Leto), plans to use the missing child for his own purposes and kill K if he has to.

My main problem with the film is that it was unforgivably boring. The film is two hours and forty-five minutes long, which is already enough to test one's patience (and bladder), but it feels so deliberately paced; the characters almost always move so slow, that it feels like the filmmakers thought that it was the best way to pad out the running time, despite having not enough material to justify it.

The performances range from great to laughable. Harrison Ford is hardly in the movie, and his inclusion is clearly a marketing ploy, but he gives the best performance in his brief running time and he feels like a continuation of his character from the original, Deckard, in a world where things have just gotten worse. Gosling isn't bad as K, and his stone-face actually is pretty effective in a couple of scenes, but Rutger Hauer in the original gave his Replicant character more of a personality. Leto is trying and failing to bring a degree of menace as the villain, and his female Replicant sidekick competes with him in the field of phoning it in.

What else shocked me was how unsubtle the film was. The original was not only a futuristic crime noir that had Harrison Ford's Deckard

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

chasing down androids, but also a personal journey involving himself and Rutger Hauer as the villain that involved trying to find a degree of humanity in such a futuristic world, and that maybe, Deckard is a replicant himself. Here, the story is mainly of Gosling trying to come to terms with the fact that he is a Replicant and what it means in terms of his humanity. Whereas in the original, there were subtle signs, images, and bits of dialogue that hinted at Deckard's purpose in the original, everything is spelled out for the audience to the point that old bits of dialogue are repeated thrice at important moments. It doesn't respect the audience's intelligence at all. The first and final thirds of the film are mainly filled with dialogue that is basically speeches that preach ideas about conflict and the ethics of machines, but hardly any of it is explored in an interesting fashion. What's worse, the film feels so empty and devoid that for a time, I forgot what K's objective was.

What I will say is that the cinematography is beautiful. There are a lot of colorful images with ancient ruins and futuristic tech in the background and foreground that could easily pass as being part of an art gallery. The only downside is that there is too much gray in some shots and it feels too clean compared to the original.

Why Warner Brothers and Sony wasted their time making this film, I have no clue. Maybe it was Ridley Scott's fault. After being unimpressed with his *Alien: Covenant* earlier this year (and was also quite the snooze-fest), watching this only proved to me further that Scott just doesn't care about good filmmaking anymore. Denis Villeneuve is clearly an ambitious director, but his style didn't feel completely right for this film. Clearly, in a film that tries so desperately to say much more humanity than its predecessor, it comes out feeling empty and feels less human than the original did.

P.S. A lot of people have accused me of being too shallow and wanting this film to be more action packed. I do not have that mindset. I enjoy films that take their time as much as the next film enthusiast, but this one just didn't do enough to justify what it was aiming for. I'm not ashamed in expressing my opinion. Just let me be clear on something: going at a slow, deliberate pace and speaking lines of preachy dialogue does not, I repeat, does not equal intelligence. The positive reviews baffle me, especially on Rotten Tomatoes. Sony owns the company, which leads me to think that maybe it bribed more than a few critics in the hopes that more people would see it. Clearly, that is backfiring and I'm happy that people are rejecting it.

Rating: 129

3

Content: 129 , Size: 6420

In 1982 I was deeply excited about the prospect of seeing "Blade Runner," and can remember applying for a chance to see an advance showing in Sacramento. From the start it seemed obvious that it was a

special film--clouded in controversy and mystery. Later I acquired my much-viewed VHS copy, with all the eye-gouging, nail-puncturing violence. Later still the Internet provided background information as, eventually, did articles plus a comprehensive book by Paul M. Sammon. In short, I am a fan, and was eagerly anticipating the sequel.

So, it was with disappointment that I left an October 6, 2017 showing "Blade Runner 2049." Overly long, boring, poorly paced, and confusing were my initial impressions, though admittedly it was beautifully filmed (potential Oscar nomination in cinematography?).

I appreciated the many (too many?) subtle and not-so-subtle nods to the original film, the effort to build on the "Blade Runner" universe, and efforts by writers, directors, and actors to bring the story to life. But there were just too many scenes that should have been reduced in length from 25-50% of their run time. Such excess in a film is, to me, almost always a fatal flaw. And some scenes (e.g., where characters "Joi" and "Mariette" merge to make love to "K") could have been cut altogether, I feel, without harming the story.

The acting was satisfactory or better, for the most part, as one would expect from the level of supporting talent.* However, I have knowingly seen two pictures starring Ryan Gosling—2016's "La La Land" and now this—and in both he is bland and wooden. Despite the fact that "2049's" "K" is SUPPOSED to be a self-controlled, artificial humanoid, I wonder if it is just Gosling's natural on- (and off-) screen persona. And frankly, Harrison Ford's "Deckard" just did not work for me. Sacrilegious, I know; but true. I blame this on two factors.

First, Ford appears (too) late in the movie, by which time I was already exhausted by tedium. Second, for a character without appearance-changing makeup, a dramatic accent, say, or pronounced behavioral distinctions, it is hard not to just see Harrison Ford. (Kind of like Robert Redford miscast in 1985's "Out of Africa.") Oh, it's (old) Harrison Ford again. Sorry HF fans everywhere.

And another thing; due to poor direction, they included "Admiral William Adama" (Edward James Olmos) from TV's "Battlestar Galactica," and not "Gaff" (also Olmos), in a too brief cameo. (Listen to "Gaff" in the 1982 original. Totally different voicing.)

Like most films, it suffered from its share of "Oh, come on!" moments. Why would 6-foot "K" allow 6-foot-6 Dave Bautista's imposing "Sapper Morton" to make the first move (and thus begin the accumulation of a ridiculous amount of damage, most of it unnecessary, sustained by "K" throughout the story)? Because that's what movie detectives do. I must say, "K" apparently likes to pass violently through solid walls (a nod to Rutger Hauer's "Roy Batty" head in the original, I take

it).

Almost all action-adventure films are silly in hindsight and full of movie plot clichés; Blade Runner 2014 is no exception. But the test

of a good movie is whether the story flows at a pace that makes audiences subconsciously accept and even relish these otherwise nonsensical encumbrances (see 1999's The Matrix). For my part I was less inclined to give Blade Runner 2014 a pass on the silliness due to its plodding nature.

Ridley Scott is prominently associated with both the recent Alien; and

Blade Runner; franchises, and has promised multiple sequels. Do we want this? Is state-of-the-art movie-making worth either ridiculously poor stories (the Alien franchise) or bad plotting and editing (Blade Runner 2014)? It's admittedly hard to make a good movie, but Scott and his people are paid a LOT of money to do so. Check Scott's IMDb filmography. Can any mortal be involved first-hand in that many projects? As with Stephen King, maybe it's time to stop the quantity and re-focus on the quality? Just saying.

In conclusion, my disappointment focused primarily on the script and editing.

Some recommendations to potential viewers: First, if you plan to see

Blade Runner 2014; it will help to see one of 37 versions (e.g., voice-over or no voice-over; graphic violence shots or not?) of the original 1982 film beforehand. Second, maybe wait to watch the movie digitally, so that you can re-play key scenes and increase volume on important dialogue. In the theater I kept mentally reaching for a non-existent remote control. Third, (after Recommendation One) if like me you hold the original picture in deep admiration as a flawed but intriguing analog masterpiece of SF movie-making, consider skipping this sequel altogether. But I imagine that warning will fall on deaf ears.

* Because of the look and feel of two female characters in the film, I

wonder if actresses Felicity Jones (Rogue One) and Tatiana Maslany (Orphan Black) were originally considered for the parts eventually played by Ana de Armas (companion hologram Joi) and Sylvia Hoeks (deadly replicant Luv). While watching the trailer footage, I originally mistook those two characters for actresses Jones and Maslany. Their doppelgangers did just fine, though. Hoeks; Luv; is particularly chilling.

** Oh, and the music! Not so good. Too often I was aware of background

music--that by itself is not a good thing--and its shortcomings. So much so that by the end of 2014, where original Blade Runner; music

(Tears in the Rain; I think) is (finally) used, it left me with mixed feelings. First, thank god! Second, where was that musical excellence during the rest of the film? Music can make or break a film, and is incredibly important. Few excellent films have poor musical soundtracks. Unfortunately, Blade Runner 2014; is not an exception to that guideline.

Rating: 130

5

Content: 130 , Size: 980

...the return of the giant Atari sign from the original Blade Runner.

OK, quick story synopsis. Bones found of a Replicant who's given birth. How was it possible and where is the child (now adult)?

I'm sorry, but having waited 35 years for this movie it just didn't press any buttons for me. It's an hour too long, the story-line is weak to non-existent and doesn't get answered, the theory of Deckard's origin is again teased at but not answered (even though there really is very little in the original to point to him being a replicant).

This is another SFX over substance movie. Looks good, although very dark in the 3D version, but there just doesn't seem to be the energy and edginess of the original. It all seems too NICE.

Having seen the original movie over 30 times, I'm not sure I'll bother returning to this new story. I have to agree with Rutger Hauer about trying to add to a perfect movie.

Rating: 131

3

Content: 131 , Size: 1079

The first movie (which should have stayed the only movie) is a masterpiece of sci fi. I was hooked from the start great story and for the time great FX also cannot beat the soundtrack by Vangelis.

Not sure what is going on with Ridley Scott first with is Alien Covenant he destroyed the series there and now with the new addition of blade runner.

I feel that all the positive reviews for this movie are fake, because the movie is a sad excuse to make money and makes no sense at all, no surprised it failed this weekend at the box office.

The acting is good so are the special effects, but the story is weak and none existent, Tyrell corporation is gone and there is a new company that makes the replicans, and tyrell had found a way for them to reproduce and have babies.

This is where the story gets weird, Deckard is brought back into the mix because he had a child with Rachel.

The movie also lack action and in the end does not explain anything. I felt like a huge waste of 2h and a half.

35y in the making for this wow just wow.

Rating: 132

1

Content: 132 , Size: 1878

The original Blade Runner is one of my favourite films so I was really

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

looking forward to this one. What a disappointment. If I wasn't in the company of others I would of walked out early. I left the cinema feeling annoyed that I had to sit through this overlong monotonous film. The storyline is dragged out with the main character just going from place to place to investigate something like in a video game. At the beginning he is in a fight scene and you find out he is basically indestructible. The replicants are now terminators. This leaves out any suspense that he is in danger. The first film was kind of believable, the city was overcrowded and the building were decaying - it had atmosphere. This one looked like a more modern city with a lot of emptiness. The technology has advanced so much that he now has a solid light fully realistic AI holographic companion that operates from a small device he can keep in his pocket. If you think about it why are they so desperate to increase replicant slave labour production when they are capable of building AI robots that can be enveloped with holographic light to look human. They still have the blurry 1950 TV quality monitors to echo the first film but the supposed technology jump does not make sense. The music by Vangelis was one of the most important parts of the original. He conveyed through the use of synthesisers and traditional instruments a sense of awe and wonder, beauty and the sadness of a dystopian world. Johann Johannsson was originally commissioned to score the film and I think he would of done a great job but they decided for some reason it was not Hollywood sounding enough so they bought in Hans Zimmer. What a disaster. It might as well be the music from Batman VS Alien. Just lots of loud noise. The original was a box office failure that became a cult classic. This is just a failure.

Rating: 133

2

Content: 133 , Size: 2618

SPOILERS ALERT: The biggest difference between 1982 masterpiece and this one is that in the first film everything is happening at a normal speed. In original movie people talk like they talk in real life, their move at perfectly normal, every day, common speed, it doesn't take them forever to finish the sentence, or to shape out a thought, and yet... somehow it all works perfectly together.

There's no way to know how will people (let alone robots) act or talk in thirty plus years, but if it is to be anything like in BR2049, I suspect it will be a pretty bleak and exhausting world.

From the moment one, everybody talks, walks, plays, runs in some super-strange slow-mo: I'd say at 50% of the normal speed. It takes 10 seconds for poor Ryan Gosling only to take out something from his pocket. Not to say how long it takes him to walk through the scene - so much that half way through, let's say, the orphanage part, I have already forgotten what is he doing there in the first place.

20 minutes into the movie, all I'm doing is wondering when this shot is

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

going to end, when this scene is going to end, when the sequence will, and, ultimately, when the movie is going to end. This is not the way to pay a homage, to anybody or anything.

There is a reason why the shots in "2001 Odyssey..." are that long, somebody should've warned the director about that. And there's also a reason why all shots in the original BR are that tight. And that's just one of the reasons to why both 2001 and BR are masterpieces. And for that same reason, BR2049 could that never be.

You don't drag out every single aspect of the movie just to make it seem serious or pretend to be an artist, no. If you do, you get very expensive, anemic boredom. I have no idea why the director did it - he hasn't done it in that fairly fair movie with Hugh Jackman. What possessed him to do it here? Was it the importance of the first movie? Was it his fear to look like a schoolboy in front of the Master? Don't know, don't care.

What a waste of great actors, class all - forcing them to engage in some sort of quasi elevated, quasi profound, but genuinely bizarre ballet that has nothing, nothing, nothing to do with the real life. The movie is three hours plus long only for the given reason - it would have been an hour shorter if had played out at normal pace.

Oh - and to end here - the biggest dread of all: a hint of a possible franchise. Please, please, please people, for the love of all that's holly. Don't.

Rating: 134

5

Content: 134 , Size: 5291

Please be aware that my review contains spoilers so please do not read further if you do want to have key plot points revealed.

First things first, I'm a big fan of the original and have enjoyed immensely with each viewing, first from when I was a 10 year old until 2 weeks ago so I was interested to see what Villeneuve would do with the sequel.

Watched it Saturday and must say the experience left me somewhat underwhelmed and frustrated at seeing such an opportunity to do something original go to waste, that I have decided to post my thoughts here on IMDb for the first time.

In no particular here are some of my questions and general points about the film.

Jared Leto's performance. How the hell is he such a high paid star? I cannot think of anything he is particularly memorable and this is no exception.

His eyes. Are they distracting on purpose?

If his character saved the world from starvation, how come there aren't millions of people worshiping him? Humans are suckers for finding idols and why shouldn't his character be any different. Crikey, we have dictators in our world who had days and months of the year named after family members.

Why doesn't he have a massive army organised to hunt down Deckard

instead of entrusting this to one replicant and a few goons?

Monologues giving exposition is lazy storytelling and old Wallace loves a monologue.

What is his plan? He wants to produce more replicants but kills one at the start for some spurious reason. Hint hint, to show the audience he is a very naughty. He also has the Rachel replicant killed. No wonder he cannot make enough replicants if he keeps killing them.

Ryan Gosling plays Ryan Gosling again and although I don't dislike his performances, I find it hard to root for his character here, as I've seen it before in a much better film (Drive).

The music wasn't particularly memorable and only made me think of the much better soundtrack from Bladerunner. Apparently this was intentional on Villeneuve's part as he removed the original composer who wanted to do something original. So instead, the director opted for Zimmer to make it more Bladerunnery and therefore less memorable for this film.

The film did not merit or need the run-time it had. I appreciate the original BR took its time but it had a new world to show us

The ending was goofy and ridiculous. Why would K bring Deckard to his daughter who is the most wanted person in the history of want people? This will definitely endanger her given that Leto's character has a relationship with her and probably has her under some sort of surveillance.

Hero comes back from the dead to say the day cliché; at end was extremely predictable and had me rolling my eyes, which I shouldn't be doing the first time I watch a film.

The blackout sounds like a much more interesting story than this. Caused by replicants? A solar flare? Was there a Trump two term presidency in this universe?

Robots reproducing and creating their own has already been cover in Battlestar Galactica, who did it in a more compelling fashion with characters and stakes I cared about

Plus, how come Leto's character hasn't figured out on to get replicants to reproduce? Why can't he produce them faster? How many has he killed before delivering a monologue

Some of the visuals are stunning though lack depth or colour. The future looks fairly boring in comparison to Bladerunner 1982, which offered some very unusual street shots and characters. One included a guy with a eagle on his head. Nothing to really catch the eye in BR2049.

Why not have Rachel as leader of the rebellion instead of some random person the audience has no connection with.

When the capture Deckard, why on earth wouldn't they kill K?

How did K know how to find the car with Dekkard at the end? We don't see him doing any investigative work to discover this information, despite the long run time.

They made a replicant clone of Rachel but get the eye colour wrong? Seriously?

How heavy handed was the prejudice? No subtlety whatsoever.

Jeepers,
you spend all that money on effects but then go minimum wage on screen writers.

That sex scene reminded me of Ghost with all the syncing going on. Watching Whoopi do her thing was just as sexy as watching this scene, despite it having two incredibly attractive women present, along with Ryan Gosling who is no slouch himself in the looks department.

The replicant rebellion feels shoehorned in rather than something which has grown and developed organically. Need to take lessons from Star Wars on how to introduce a rebel alliance story.

The golden rule of cinema is broken here when they show/play clips from a much better film.

Critics are only offering gushing praise for a film with considerable flaws because they don't wish to get caught out like the critics of 82. Back then, the critics hated it because they couldn't see the hidden depth, this time they see depth that simply isn't there. Even one of the character says something along these lines to another.

Rating: 135

1

Content: 135 , Size: 2640

BR2049 has more plot holes than emmental cheese and one big "plot twist" that I won't mention, not because it would spoil much, but because if you decide to watch this movie, you deserve to be disappointed by its stupidity.

The big "twist" is mentioned as the "miracle", but it is absolutely idiotic and illogical from the point of view of a manufacturer of replicants. How did "that" might have ever be considered a good idea? One would assume that after the disaster of the Nexus 6 series, Tyrell Co. and his successors would have invented some more reliable security system - such as a lower level of self-consciousness, way safer than the questionable "obedience" of the Nexus 8. Or even something like all the androids looking the same, so that they can be easily detected and you would not need blade runners to locate and eliminate them.

Anything that would provide humanity with useful, free labor without ethical problems… But no, in this movie ethical problems just got exponentially bigger. And so much for a science so advanced as to reproduce perfect bodies and minds...

Besides, since it is established that humankind sucks, I failed to understand how replicants are in any way better, since they just want to be more "like humans"….

On the visual side, BR2049 sucks, too. Looks like they used random leftovers scenery from other Sc-Fi/disaster movies, from the overused industrial background of Terminator to the desertic blurred landscape of MadMax and the inevitable nightmarish city-scape, which looks like Blade Runner, but on cheap side. Costumes looks like the contemporary drab clothing promoted by Nordic high street chains: lots of dark, cheap-looking leggings and stretchy tops, a far cry from the decadent,

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

elaborate futuristic/retro suits of BR.

In one scene, Deckard meets Tyrell's successor in a closed room filled with water, except a square island in the middle. A room that has no other reason to exist except bringing back memories of the "original" Tyrell building.

The dialog is unbelievable bad and scenes drag on forever. When the Goslin character finds Deckard, the two spend over ten minutes fighting and chasing each other, when a couple of lines of dialogue would have avoided that.

The ending is both manipulative and plagiarist: it wants to move the audience, recreating the amazing poetic moment of Roy Batty's death, but using snow instead of rain. If nothing else, the ending would have been enough to put me off this piece of commercial garbage.

Rating: 136

8

Content: 136 , Size: 4453

I've only seen the original Blade Runner once and it was a long time ago. I liked it but I just haven't got around to revisiting it. I mention this because even though I'm not a die-hard fan of Blade Runner, I still found the plot of 2049 engrossing. It's a well put together mystery, I found that they constantly took the plot in unexpected directions and other than the trailer spoiling the return of Deckard, I was always excited about what was going to happen next. The movie pulls an excellent bait and switch at the end that really surprised me. They made the right decision to not repeat the formula of the first one and take the story to a new place. They also create some compelling subplots which is something that few movies get right.

The biggest star of this movie is the cinematography and the excellent work of Roger Deakins. The original was noteworthy with the special environment that Ridley Scott and his creative team brought to the screen. That was continued here if not improved upon. The look of L.A. in 2049 they decided to go with isn't completely distinct but it was a little more understated (I'd compare it to the 2017 Ghost in the Shell but less fantastical). My favourite scene might have been a shootout in a defunct club where the lighting and the background show are turning on and off. I don't hesitate to praise when a movie looks good but this is an exemplary example of using visuals and atmosphere to help build on a strong story.

Blade Runner 2049 returns very few of the characters from the original film but they manage to breathe life into this movie through the new ones they created. Officer K isn't the most lively protagonist but he gets an eye-opening character arc that kept me involved. Deckard doesn't appear till later in the movie but he remains interesting and what they decide to do with him makes his appearance worthwhile. I also really liked some of the smaller supporting characters. Sapper really helps kick off the movie, what Joi represents is extremely emotional

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

and Mariette is so mysterious that her involvement brings up more and more questions. Add in that Niander Wallace and Luv make for pretty menacing villains and you have a pretty well-rounded and fascinating script.

I don't think that the actors/actresses will be the focal point of the

awards attention that this movie will get but that doesn't mean there aren't exemplary performances. Gosling is good as K, he's deliberately robotic and he accomplishes a lot through his subtlety. Harrison Ford isn't in the movie as much as I wanted him to be (he's still one of my all-time favourite actors) but he holds up his end. He works with Gosling well and they have a solid rapport. Surprisingly, I really liked Sylvia Hoeks. She stole a lot of her scenes and I thought she was great even acting against a stacked cast. Dave Bautista showed he has a lot more range than people give him credit for. Jared Leto is in a very Jared Leto role (deliberately weird and hard to understand) but he does it well and although he might be a little creepy, the guy is still a great actor. I also want to credit Ana de Armas, she was distinctly warm and she showed a lot more emotion than I had seen from her previously.

There were points in this movie I could have rated this a 9/10 but some

small things that I had to dock the movie for. Even with a compelling story, the movie has such a long run time that it couldn't help but drag. There are certain scenes where the movie wants you to really drink in the environment but they could have edited it a little tighter. They also couldn't help but lose me at points through how much artistic flair they utilize. Villeneuve is an authority in this area and while I appreciate an artistic approach to this science fiction tale, for me they overdid it a little.

I was surprised how much I ended up liking Blade Runner 2049. I think

if you're a big fan of the original, you'll love this to bits. This is successful in bringing in the uninitiated but I think fans will enjoy this even more. I haven't been on board for all of Villeneuve's films but this is a good combination of his artistic style with enough of a commercial element for the masses. I'd give this somewhere between an 8-9 but with the extremely long run time, I'll give this an 8/10.

Rating: 137

8

Content: 137 , Size: 2572

So, I didn't expect much from this sequel when it was announced, but since the original Blade Runner is, in my opinion, one of the greatest movies ever made (if not the greatest), I had to see it anyways. As I often do, I didn't read any reviews or watch any trailers before going.

So, where do we start... While not perfect, and inferior to the original, this is still a great movie. Visually it's simply stunning and the actors are all excellent. Just as importantly, or maybe even more so, like the original it combines a slow pace and fantastic

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

ambiance to create an introspective mood and invite reflection on some important themes and issues of our time. (although, maybe, lacking a dialogue with the same power as the Roy Batty monologue at the end of the first movie).

As some negative reviewers said, it is slow..... but that works well

with the story and its intent to create a very clear, pervasive mood rather than to dazzle with dumb car chases, gunfights, or explosions, not to mention pushing the viewer to form his own opinions. The boring part is subjective: for viewers who like to be challenged intellectually I'd say many action movies are a lot more boring. Nothing wrong with escapist movies, which I also enjoy when I'm in the right mood, but it doesn't change the fact that they're inherently much more predictable, superficial and formulaic. In other words, entertaining but intellectually boring.

Regarding Blade Runner 2049, one disappointment, though, to be honest, was the soundtrack: aside from being too loud, it really consists mostly of weird sounds/noises etc. While they do heighten the mood at times, or fit the atmosphere, they are not really not up to the lofty standards of the photography, the action, or the direction.

Also, the plot could have been a little tighter, and while the slow pace is what this movie needed, I'm not convinced it really had to be this long (or to touch on so many themes, as it does).

Still, it's a fantastic, and unique, viewing experience, and even with its imperfections it does create a believable (if gloomy and depressing) dystopian vision of the future, and touches on themes that could spark endless debate and reflection. And herein lies its beauty: shallow popcorn movies will have faded from everybody's memory in weeks. A movie like Blade Runner 2049 will inspire us and challenge us, whether we agree with some of its vision or not, maybe even whether we love it or hate it, for years to come.

Rating: 138

1

Content: 138 , Size: 1608

I always gave the original Blade Runner 10/10. Seen it a over a 1000 times including at the movie theater. Good pace, visuals, music, likable characters, bad guys. Yup, pretty much everything. One of my top 10 movies of all time. This review for 2049 is not because it should be the same thing or make it over the top.

OK now this Blade Runner 2049. Bad boring. Where nothing really means much. Unlikable characters, music is "meh" nothing unique (A poor version of the original_. Bad people in this, who cares? Bring us back with someone who is actually a threat (like Roy). We have some stupid terminator woman who really just flat out sucks. Poor casting. Jared Leto sucks. Yeah, he really does. Then you have the black guy with a cane from walking dead, who talks to everyone sideways. Who talks to people sideways? Why did you cast him? I've never see someone in any

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

other movie, show or real life talk to people when they are not looking at them. Fail!!! I thought it was stupid in walking dead and now its really stupid. Plot is blah. Oh, it's also like a journey for Ryan Gosling to go from one Cameo to another with another boring scene. Not much vocab, emotion. Even Roy in the original had TONS of emotion and even had poetry at the end when he decided to turn a corner and save life instead of destroying everything in his path.

Harrison Ford is just an old man in this(sorry to say). Think it's time to retire. Did nothing in this film except hold a gun in Ryan's face and get captured with handcuffs.

Do not believe the hype, not a good movie.

Rating: 139

6

Content: 139 , Size: 694

What a disappointment, so much hype and, therefore, expectation but this is no more than a competent sci-fi film, certainly not a worthy successor to the original. I could support a 163 minute run time if there was plenty of content but at times it felt like the actors were moving and speaking slowly not for effect, but to fill in the gaps. As for the plot, everything revolved around the ability or otherwise of replicants to breed. If you have the technology to grow a human body from scratch and implant whatever memories you want I'd have thought introducing the mechanics of reproduction wouldn't be difficult. I could go on but really, this film isn't worth the bother.

Rating: 140

1

Content: 140 , Size: 866

i cannot believe these ten star comments, first the visuals were mostly flat, there was no explanation why in this time there were virtually no people around, one scene only with about thirty extras, no lights seems to be on either in the shots were he is flying over the city. more importantly you had a very thin plot that could have been told in less than an hour. nothing happens for most of the film. it is as if all concerned were on valium. the music was just noise. talk about an anti-climatic ending, the film just whimpers out. none of the very little plot made any sense. so here we have yet again critics raving about nothing. an insult to the original in every way. do not waste your time or money going to see this. i was going to list the many non-sensical things in the film but on reflection i don't think the film deserves anymore of my time

Rating: 141

9

Content: 141 , Size: 2073

Similar responses to the original Bladerunner when it came out in 1982 (when feel-good hit ET was in theaters) and how people didn't know what to make of the then bleak, slow-paced Sci-Fi film. This is not unlike introducing Guardians of the Galaxy fans to 2049 today, an even darker, longer journey into the same Sci-Fi world. I can understand why some people might not like it, mostly due to attention spans and needing more explosions and violence with hyper-editing and a groovy soundtrack. This is not a knock on those movies, this is just a different genre. And just like the original, not everybody gets it or truly appreciates what has been accomplished here. This is a BIG movie, with a mystery that leaves you thinking and knowing that no matter what your first opinion is, a second viewing is required to even begin grasping everything you just saw. And not everybody wants to do that because they don't want to be challenged. They want the eye-candy action, a foot-tapping soundtrack and a vegetable soup ending spelled out for them (in 2 hours or less). So no, this movie is not for them.

However, if you're a fan of the original Bladerunner and that particular dystopian world, this movie takes it to another level. After seeing the original film, I remembering wondering what the world outside of the dark LA nights in 2019 would be like? And that is just one of the ways 2049 has expanded that notion, leaving an open door to an even bigger world with deeper questions beyond it. Yes it is a long and relatively slow paced movie (by design), and so was 'Once Upon a Time in the West'. And yet just like that movie as well as the original Bladerunner, over time, this too will get more and more appreciation with age (and wisdom) for those who truly appreciate the art of film-making. It's not perfect, no movie ever will ever to everybody will it? But it is an amazing achievement and I look forward to my next viewing with different eyes, taking in what I may have missed because there is so much to see and overlook.

Rating: 142

3

Content: 142 , Size: 3525

Blade Runner is one of my favorite films of all time for a number of reasons:

- 1) Amazing groundbreaking trailblazing visuals that spawned an entire genre (aka 'cyberpunk').
- 2) Superb music by Vangelis that is integral to the film.
- 3) Great characters and amazing acting.
- 4) Underlying philosophical themes of corporate oppression (Blade Runner is just a small cog in a huge machine just carrying on with his life doing the job because otherwise he's reduced to nothing), existentialism (what it means to be human) coupled with Biblical references presented in a subtle way.
- 5) Amazing practical special effects that make the world around the characters feel lived-in.
- 6) Meticulous attention to detail, lighting in particular.

While '2049' is nothing more than a mere attempt at

recreating

something in the style of the original by a studio committee ticking off the items in the checklist. The result is abysmal because it does not introduce something new in terms of visual design, interesting characters, music or story. On the contrary it tries so hard to tie itself to the original it's sickening. Call it fan-service or pandering, either way it leads to the movie being a highly derivative product that exists solely because of the original.

1) Plot lines that go against the premise of the original (Nexus 6 being able to reproduce, new Nexus 8 being easily distinguishable from humans) are stupid.

2) Acting is horrendous. Ana "Pouty lips" De Armas couldn't hold a candle to Sean Young not to mention the pretentious for pretentiousness sake Jared Leto. Ford is here for a paycheck and Gosling is deliberately one-note.

3) The music is a lame attempt at copying Vangelis's beautiful score.

4) Too varying visuals leave you with this feeling of an inconsistent world that doesn't follow the idea of polluted lifeless post-industrial world where the sun doesn't shine, it's constantly raining and the only light outside the building is that of the advertising that seems more real than anything else.

5) Running time. The original was purposefully slow while the overblown running time of the sequel comes off as director loving certain sets and trying to savor them far longer than he should've.

6) A myriad of logical mistakes and plot holes (kids with a 100% matching DNA are of different gender).

7) The opening shot with the closeup of an eye is almost beat for beat with the original.

8) The zooming sequence is hammered home by the sheer repetition.

9) The characters are bland, unoriginal and politically correct female copies of the originals, namely Madam and Luv.

10) The opening sequence is the unused part of the Fancher's script (watch Dangerous Days documentary).

Overall it seems that producers/writers have an erroneous idea of made the original film great. As if stuffing Biblical references into Neon-lit set pieces, inhabited by some pale copies of original characters and extending the awkward silences would amount to a great movie.

To sum up "Blade Runner 2049" does not reinvent the wheel, does not offer anything one-of-a-kind or even slightly memorable. There is no reason (other than cash flow for the studio execs) for it to exist. Save the cash and rewatch the original that actually challenges your intelligence and leaves you with a lot to think about.

Rating: 143

4

Content: 143 , Size: 2376

There's a lot to like about this movie. Ryan Gosling gives a fantastic

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

performance, both nuanced and surprisingly emotional. The action, when there is action, is well filmed and brutal and fun to watch. The CGI is pretty much flawless, and I'm not joking when I say that while watching this movie, you'll think you're watching a real world. The film is interesting, it's well shot, well directed, it's visually stunning, it's pretty, and the score is very thrilling. But as a whole, this movie is just so god da*n boring.

Look, I like slow paced movies, but this film is beyond slow paced.

It's brain dead. It's literally like watching a person with no arms and legs try to crawl across a football field. I won't lie, at first I liked this slow pace because it built up a lot of tension, a lot of mystery, a lot of suspense, and I assumed that eventually the film would kick into high gear; it never did. The pace remains constant throughout the entire run time of this movie. It's excruciatingly slow. The movie is almost 3 hours long, and it feels like 6. I couldn't wait for this movie to end, I mean by the end of the movie I expected to look in the mirror and see that I aged 65 years.

And also, the film is also overly convoluted. I'm not saying that this is a confusing film, because it's not; in fact, it's pretty straightforward and easy to follow. It just simply felt like this movie was convoluted for the sake of it being convoluted. At the time of watching everything felt important. I had to pee so badly the entire movie but I didn't want to get up because I felt like everything I was watching was super important. However, only after viewing do I realize that there were so many scenes that were totally unnecessary, that were there only to make the movie longer, more bloated, and more self-important.

Unfortunately, there's just not much else to say. This is a simple movie, and it gets a simple review. Look, I wanted to give this a high score, but I just couldn't, and I don't understand why other people are because this movie is simply not enjoyable or entertaining. Yes, it's well made, a feast for the eyes and ears, but that doesn't make it a good film; it makes it a well directed and produced film, but not a good one.

Rating: 144

3

Content: 144 , Size: 1912

Let me describe the sequence of Blade Runner 2049 for you

Here goes:

Enter the cinema with an overpriced orange juice that is mandatory because in the last couple of years Hollywood has decided it is artsy and de rigueur to make films longer than 2 hours. The lights dim and commercials kick in for 10 minutes. A game for pre-teens wasting daddy's money on mobile phones and plans kicks in. 2 minutes of endorsements for GM trucks (with some guy whose tone is so macho I roll my eyes) follows. Then there is a reminder to get the right debit card to be hip and in. Then the film follows for a whopping 3 hours almost.

You

would think that there was a lot happening and we were kept excited. Alas, the only thing that kept me awake was the very periodical appearance of a beautiful eye candy whether real, hologram or laser show version that would keep things exciting.

If it were not for the sexy and lovable women Blade Runner 2049 was inane. Yes, inane. Apparently, not every film needs a sequel, a lesson Hollywood didn't learn from Hangover.

The script was so corny and the words so elementary one would be excused for thinking this is a practical joke. Head of police, yes head of police is told a big lie by a contractor, head of police believes it and all is good. No double checking, no verifying, no details asked no proof required. it is a matter of life and death for the order of the world and, of OK, let's keep rolling guys. The ending was also a joke. A vehicle is drowning and the hero is being drowned but in the last second kills the bad gal and swims back to the vehicle to mount a rescue (for the sequels that will follow). Replicants can have and make babies, but how? Oh well, watch the prequel Blade Runner Rogue Uno, which is coming out in 2020.

At that point all I wanted in life was to buy my own Joi and Luv and go back home.

Rating: 145

1

Content: 145 , Size: 1554

In the ongoing tradition of Harrison Ford's Action heroes of the 1980's turning out to be really terrible dads, we have Blade Runner 2049, the sequel to 1982's Blade Runner.

We meet a replicant cop named K who is of a new variety that doesn't rebel unlike those bad ones in the movies. So he tracks down a Runaway Nexus 8, even though in the original movie, we were assured that Nexus 8's only had 4 year lifespans. During the course of this, they discover the bones of Sean Young's character from the original movie, along with the realization she had given birth.

Our hero also has a relationship with a Hologram Girl for some reason. I guess so he is sad when she gets deleted later in the movie.

If you are watching this movie to see Harrison Ford reprise his role as Deckard, you don't get to see him walking around like someone's confused grandpa until 2 hours into an interminably long movie. (Seriously, I feel bad for Ford. Why does he do this to himself?)

So they want to find the child of Deckard and Rachel because this is a replicant that can reproduce, which is supposedly more efficient than just growing them, for some reason. They say they need more replicants to colonize the outer colonies, but of course, there are plenty of people living in squalor, including a child labor sweatshop.

I can't emphasize enough how long, boring, uninteresting this movie was. It's like they watched the original and still had no idea what made it a good movie.

Rating: 146

1

Content: 146 , Size: 1081

I didn't realise 2049 also was the actual length of the film! It sure felt like it! 3 hours of boring dialogue, hollow characters and an embarrassingly weak story. Hard to believe Ridley Scott really made this!

The first Blade Runner worked the pace of the film brilliantly up to the powerful ending. The story was a rather simple sci-fi noir detective story with a twist. It made some huge comments on humanity and what kind of future we want. It worked on so many levels. It could be viewed as a simple sci-fi detective story or as a great spiritual journey that asked all the big questions. "And what can your maker do for you?".

The first Blade Runner had so many great lines but with 2049 I cannot remember a single quotable line. 2049 completely lacks all which made the original the best sci-fi movie ever. I take the same view as Rutger Hauer recently did. Why even try to do a second one? It would be as painting a second Mona Lisa. Or building another Eiffel tower.

A huge disappointment of a sequel that should never have been made.

Rating: 147

1

Content: 147 , Size: 965

I have not seen such a badly made movie in a really long time. The only thing good about this movie is the actors. who did a good job in doing what they were told to. But the story is a pathetic layering of a typical family drama projected onto flying cars that is supposed to be our future. The jest of story, we industrialize ruthlessly to shred nature and then struggle to find a human emotion within ourselves and wage a war to hold on to it. Pathetic, heard many times, over and over. I am not sure if the theme was disguised as to give a facade of art or was so poorly directed that it was not even strongly projected. Either way, it gave me headaches. And the music was so grossly out of sync with the picture, it made no sense remotely. The unnecessary loud noises had not 1% context with what was happening on screen. Ridiculously long, out of context, poor direction, senseless sound effects, sorry picture of the story. sheer torture to sit through it.

Rating: 148

6

Content: 148 , Size: 2335

After seeing the the sequel to the amazing and amazing first Blade Runner, i am not disappointed. But i am not impressed either. In summary, 2049 plays it's cards too close to the chest, but without the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

element of surprise or good main characters to back it up. So lets break this movie down shall we?

Sound: 3/10 The sound is perfectly mixed.... and that's that. Otherwise it's like the new Doom soundtrack, just a bunch of bass rumbling around on top of old Vangelis lines(but probably without the vintage hardware). A few of the tracks are Psybient/Solar Fields like, which really fit into the scenes. But overall, its pretty uninspiring.

Visuals: 7/10 The sets are amazing, but there is definitely something off. The first movie had some sets that were really realistic, which is what i think made the movie believable. There was dirt, glass, patches of color, mats, live candles. It is the same as the visual difference between Alien/Aliens and Prometheus, if that makes any sense. It is obvious that they tried to replicate the set pieces of the original, but it comes off as way, way to grandiose and large-scale.

Pacing: 2/10 Horrible. Every scene is dragged out so long that you could walk out, cook some food and come back without missing a single important thing in the story. Sure, the first Blade Runner was slow, but it wasn't moving like a drugged sloth. To sum it up, they could have easily pushed the story into an hour long movie instead of three.

Story: 4/10 This is really where they dropped the ball. The characters are so boring they might as well be extras, especially Deckers girlfriend. I didn't care about her at the start, and i didn't care about her when she died. Also, the main villain. I mean, really? What were they thinking? She is so one-dimensional, she might as well be played by Brian Thompson. And no, making her cry while she kills things does not make her more complex and believable. The villain in the first Blade Runner, played by Rutger Hauer, at least had a glowing personality. Also, some scenes and ideas are just there for shock value. You will know which ones they are.

In summary: There is not one line or scene in the whole movie which is even close to the quality of the monologue at the end of the first movie.

Rating: 149

5

Content: 149 , Size: 1008

As someone I know said, this is a "cargo cult movie". It has all the exterior of what a great Blade runner sequel would look like but there is little underneath.

Visuals are stunning, music and sound are good, camera work is as it should be, but when you get down to its core, there's little there. I am not usually the one to complain about a slow pacing or a plot that requires some suspense of belief, but here It seems they serve as a way to achieve the deep and philosophical feel without actually being either. Acting overall is mediocre at best, actors fail to convincingly relay emotion of the characters, that are themselves written quite shallow, unrelatable and one dimensional. There are some interesting

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

questions raised by the plot, the whole thing is far from a total disaster, but nothing is explored deep enough or clearly enough to be truly interesting or engaging. That's why this movie is going to be remembered just as a sequel to it's famous original.

Rating: 150

1

Content: 150 , Size: 484

This movie was so bad I can't put into words. I loved Blade Runner but this sequel is so bad I can no longer watch the original.

Music over the top Acting nonexistent Length, felt like 6 hours, and not in a good way

As people left the theater I saw shaking heads.

Don't understand people raving about it. They must be connected to the film somehow.

Save your money, watch the original and don't let this ruin it for you like it did for me

Rating: 151

7

Content: 151 , Size: 5744

Being a hardcore Blade Runner and science fiction fanatic, I felt deeply compelled to write this review. I love Ridley Scott's original 1982 Sci-Fi classic. It is my all-time favorite movie. It had mystique and infused my imagination. It was a unique experience; hypnotic & surreal. The sequel, not so much!

My initial reaction of BR 2049 was that it's a gorgeous film. I was mesmerized by the striking cinematography and couldn't take my eyes off the screen. I will go as far saying that it's one of the most beautiful films I've ever seen. The rich visuals are so glaring it's hard to take it all in and grasp what you are seeing. From the opening shot you know you're in Blade Runner world. The overall look is instantly relatable to the first film and it's an amazing continuation in that regard. Also, the acting was excellent. The entire cast did a great job. However, once I settled into the film I realized that it is mainly a self-indulgent visual feast containing a weak story that lacks clarity & wisdom. There are obvious cliché moments and in certain aspects the story is comical and naive. The movie delves into complex philosophical themes and asks important questions but seldom explores them. It's all over the place. You get the sense that the film is not sure what it wants to be? It's clearly style over substance. Lots of homage is paid to the original through awesome images but the plot is paper-thin with a few subplots & twists added to make it seem intelligent. But is it? Well, not really! I think the movie tries too hard to be smart but fails to engage due to its long running time & fuzzy story/script, which may end up confusing and distancing the viewer.

BR 2049 has been most

widely criticized for its length, and rightly so.

It's overly long with some unnecessary scenes & dialogue whereas the first film was more subtle. BR1 was also slow-paced but in a different way. It had suspense and gradual progression to climax whereas BR2 is forced and even distracting at times. I love slow-paced films don't get me wrong! I can watch a film all day as long as it leads to a point and has tension. Certain films are deliberately made slow to establish a specific mood (e.g. Kubrick & Tarkovsky films). They draw you inside the film and make you feel like you're part of it. BR1 does this perfectly while the sequel is stretched out for the wrong reasons. It comes across as an excuse to showcase impressive visuals which is great if it moves the story along but not for the fun of it. BR1 had long takes and brief dialogue but it drove the story along smoothly and its characters behaved realistically. There was a seamless flow to it. It's humorous how BR2 tried to mimic this technique from BR1 yet failed because its characters talk & move super slowly unlike real life.

Although it's a visually stunning film, I found it to be almost void of

emotions and musicality. The characters were uninteresting and lacked emotional depth. In other words, I didn't care about them. I was not sure about any of the characters' motivations. In the first film, all the characters shined with charismatic personalities. They were unique in their own way and I truly cared about them. They embodied everything that makes us human. This was a vital element that made the original so special. BR2 on the other hand has sad and forgettable characters. It is a very sad film whereas the original had moments of happiness to mix up feelings and lighten the mood, which made it more realistic.

The music in BR 2049 was the biggest let down for me. It just didn't make sense because there was no music. A strange mix of very loud noises with faint echoes of original Vangelis tones interlaced (I listened to the entire score to be sure!). The musical score by Vangelis in the first film was one of the key elements that made the original my favorite film of all-time. I love atmospheric films that are visually & musically driven to tell the story. The music creates different feelings that make you fantasize. It makes you feel the movie and think about it long after it's over. The music in BR1 was incredible. It set the tone of the film perfectly. There was a haunting eerie atmosphere that along with the images created a hypnotic feel. Vangelis mostly used an electronic sound but he also incorporated piano & saxophone for melancholic effect. Not so in BR2. They messed up enormously this time. I know it's not possible to recreate Vangelis but they could have at least tried to create similarly-styled music by using the original score as a foundation. Even better, they could have perhaps made a completely original soundtrack all together. Blade Runner is an atmospheric film that is about feel and therefore must have a perfect music to visual ratio. Sure, they brought back one Vangelis theme for nostalgia but it wasn't enough.

To conclude, I enjoyed the film but unfortunately cannot say I loved

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

it. I simply cannot fathom the enormous praise given by critics & moviegoers. I don't think they understood what made the first film brilliant. BR 2049 does contain the main elements required for a true Sci-Fi film but fell flat at further exploring its themes. The original film on the other hand is a masterpiece. It felt spiritual & spellbinding whilst the sequel did not. Should you go see it? Yes. I would still recommend fans and anyone curious to go see this film in theaters despite its evident flaws. But as a huge fan it left me disappointed. Maybe I had high expectations!

I gave it a generous 7/10

Rating: 152

3

Content: 152 , Size: 1431

All the problems with the original theatrical version of Blade Runner, which Scott Ridley fought against are here. Ridley has become the studio system.

Blade Runner 2049, likely the least desired sequel in history, is making Philip K Dick roll in his grave. What is the point of this almost three hour-long sequel? Of course, it is to continue the film industry's addiction to sequels and make cash. That is it.

Let me get this straight: the world is devastated and anyone who is anybody moves off-world, but people are living in spacious luxury in a casino drinking fine aged Scotch? There is beautiful white snow falling from the skies and sexy call girls approach you on the street? This world is for schmucks, but the main character has an artificial girlfriend with legs to die for waiting at home for him making dinner and giving him threesome sex? Someone book me a ticket back from off-world to Earth please!

This was the kind of logical misstep that Ridley fought against when the studio released BR to cinemas with a gorgeous drive through the countryside at the end of the original. It makes no sense.

Face it, this is the film that should not exist and by watching all these 'franchise' films we feed the stupidity of Hollywood.

BR2049 is the same as the last 10 marvel films, the next ten Star Wars films and the Ghostbusters sequel, but is prettier and more visual.

Rating: 153

3

Content: 153 , Size: 2728

"Blade Runner 2049" comes off incredibly long and boring. Not because of the slow pacing – "Blade Runner" had slow pacing too, but had the viewer hypnotized – but because there's no interesting thoughts present and nothing new really. Thematically the movie is exploring the same questions (about being human etc.) as the first movie did 35 years ago. And the few 'new' additions to the Blade Runner universe are totally devoid of originality. Take for instance K's hologram-wife. Not only

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

are those scenes totally unnecessary (that three-way scene, jeez!), but we've seen the concept so many times before (for instance in Spike Jonze's Her).

Apart from that, the movie is riddled with plot holes and stuff that just doesn't make very much sense. Tyrell gets killed off by a replicant and his Nexus-7 prototype runs off, shortly after Tyrell Corp rushes a line of replicants with OPEN ENDED lifespans and no other safety device than implanted memories (that didn't work with Rachael). No. Just no.

Furthermore we are told the nexus 9 are programmed to obey. However K lies to his superiors, constantly acts on his own, acts emotionally from early on in the movie. He does not obey at all.

And the revelation of a replicant child being born has people talking about revolution. Robin Wright's Joshi says it will break the world;. But how? Rachael was the only replicant able to give birth and Tyrell took that secret with him. Neither the few remaining Nexus 8's or the 9's can give birth ; so no, it doesn't break the world. It doesn't break anything. But the movie really wants us to take this very seriously (Hans Zimmer is doing his loudest to make us sit in awe).

And it gets even worse. Later we learn that Jared Leto's ridiculous bad guy Wallace (those monologues!) strives to learn the secret of making replicant babies. But why? That undermines the entire idea of replicants. Tailormade slaves with superhuman ability; strength, intelligence etc. that are controlled by implanted memories. Having replicants make babies the old way would offer zero control of the outcome and the child replicants would have to grow up, go to school, make their own memories. What's the point then? And what's the difference, from just having some people make babies?

A lot of people has called Blade Runner 2049; intellectual sci-fi; and so forth, but I found it to be quite the contrary. The movie forcefully demands you to accept it as highly intelligent art, but if you scratch the surface, you'll find something very different.

Rating: 154

7

Content: 154 , Size: 2275

Beautiful and empty Bladerunner 2049 is the needless squeal to the 1980s classic.

Set 30+ years after the events of the first film we meet Ryan Gosling continuing in the Bladerunner tradition of shooting robots. Along the way, he discovers a great secret that might change the social order of a world that is made up of humans and they're purpose built slaves.

All of that was covered in the first 20 minutes of the film by the way. Skip ahead to the 3rd act, grumpy Harrison Ford shows up and, well, that's about it.

Leaving the theatre my wife and I tried to decide just why Bladerunner left us both feeling so indifferent to it's existence. She had never

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

seen the first film, I had, but our feelings were the same. Bladerunner is great to look at and I appreciated the nods to the original, but, it became quickly apparent our apathy stemmed from the fact nothing much happens in this movie.

Office K's (Gosling) investigation into a missing person moves at snails pace and none of the people we meet along the way are as interesting as the scenery around them. One example is Wallace (Jared Leto) the new Tyrell and the main villain of the film. His speeches are dull and only go to serve the plot, he leaves all of his serious evilness to his sidekick while he stays home sporting a handicap which must be a desired physical affectation considering how easily it could be treated in his time.

The main theme in both Bladerunner movies is one day the slaves will cast off their chains and be free. Sure, there's stuff about love and self-awareness but these are side issues that have been explored elsewhere to better effect. The main focus of 2049 is humanity needs an indentured underclass to do its heavy lifting and either you are for it or against it and that is a pretty thin premise for a movie this long.

Late in the film Officer K sits on a deck chair staring out over an irradiated city. He looks like a man lost, not knowing where to go next. This moment is the perfect metaphor for Bladerunner 2049. All of it's surprises are revealed too early on leaving both the audience and characters to mull over the same obvious of choices for the rest of the movie.

A wasted opportunity.

Rating: 155

8

Content: 155 , Size: 424

I love the book so I was really excited to see this, and I have to say I was not disappointed. The acting was brilliant and the film very well made. Aside from a few changes it mostly follows the book quite closely which I was pleased about and the end was especially well done. I have to confess that I haven't actually got round to seeing any of the other adaptations of the book yet but I certainly enjoyed this one.

Rating: 156

9

Content: 156 , Size: 833

I haven't seen the 1974 version so this movie easily stands out in all aspects to me, whether it was the camera view or the cast ensemble. While reviewing, people often forget the issue with the original story i.e. it's set entirely in the train. Considering the limited space that they had, Branagh does an amazing job with the direction. This isn't just a remake but in fact an entirely different adaptation. Not that it runs away from the main story but it has a sort of different take on it. Apart from that, Branagh easily manages to portray Poirot with all

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

his eccentricity. (The accent was the pull factor for me). Josh Gad does an amazing job with Hector McQueen. Judi Dench shines as Princess Dragomiroff along with Pfeiffer as Mrs. Hubbard. The only bummer was the fact that it leaves you wanting for more.

Rating: 157

8

Content: 157 , Size: 1225

I was a bit skeptical about this movie, but I must say I was pleasantly surprised. Of course, it's not perfect, and sometimes Branagh overdo it a little, but whoever likes the genre will be captured by the fantastic atmosphere and will not be bored, because Branagh has been able to put some pepper on the story. His Poirot convinced me and the old glories like Judy Dench, Willelm Defoe and Johnny Depp do their job and do it well, but in my opinion the most interesting notes come from the young people: I personally loved Josh Gad and Daisy Ridley, but the real surprise was Sergei Polunin: I mean, for those who saw him performing as dancer, it's not a real surprise, but it's really hard to believe it was his first time in a movie! He has given to his character this melancholy, turbulent and passionate aura, halfway between a Shakespearean prince and James Dean. His expressions, his little gestures, the way he looked at his wife, he made me feel like a teenager who cannot wait to buy his poster and stick it over her bed! And let me say, that guy definitely knows how to "handle" a woman as well as he can deliver a kick! As usual, more the critics hate a film, more it worth to be seen.

Rating: 158

7

Content: 158 , Size: 1182

I went to see Murder on the Orient Express last night and this is my review. I am rating it 7/10

A quick overview of the film is that someone is murdered on the Orient and the worlds best detective played brilliantly by Kenneth Branagh must solve this case with caution and intelligence.

The film starts smoothly with some laughs produced by Kenneth. We meet every character before the train journey and that's when the guessing begins.

I really enjoy a film that keeps you guessing and gives you a few unexpected twists. The orient certainly delivers that.

Pros: Few well timed laughs, Kenneth Branagh is fantastic, Guessing Twists, Being focused on what is going on Lovely scenery, Great cast and an intense story.

Cons: To be honest, with the type of film it is and plot. There isn't anything bad I can say about it because it delivered Agatha Christie's story very well.

An entertaining watch for those who like a mystery film with a strong

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

cast and to be engaged throughout but getting you to guess at most stages of the film.

I guessed loads but was wrong!

Thank you and hope you enjoy this review

Rating: 159

10

Content: 159 , Size: 1715

We always do the same mistake when a movie is made following a best selling novel is that we compare the novel and the movie. But we must keep in mind that novel is always superior than movies in many aspect. So my earnest request to the audience please don't compare it with the novel. When you compare you will lose the momentum of the movie. Because it is an excellent movie...A pure crime thriller of pre modern era. It has suspense as well as buried past mystery of all the passenger's life. This made the detective process more complicated.

The movie has many aspects to cheer about. It has a good portrait of some 18 th century look with all those etiquettes and manners. The movie is fully loaded with the part part story of different suspects that made it difficult for the audience to guess the final answer.

As you know most central roles were done by excellent actors and actresses there is no complaint about the acting. All the acting was very much splendid. Only it can be said that they have done it a little heavy. The dialogues are sometimes a bit too much for the audiences to capture.

Over all the movie is a little slow..Like the thriller movies of early 1960's or 70's . But it has many good things to offer. A group of excellent actors together with a fine plot and diffuse suspense has made it a good enjoyable movie. But as i said it is a bit slow and dialogue dependent movie some viewers may experience it as a boring time. i have to say you had better show some patience and you will find the gold. This is A movie that can shake you when you will watch it even for the second time..Imagine what will happen when you go for the first time??????

Rating: 160

10

Content: 160 , Size: 1192

Kenneth Branagh does it again. For many years the sniffy set of Guardian-types would turn up their Metropolitan noses at Agatha Christie. Her writing was, evidently, not high-brow, she churned out too many and (horror of horrors) she wrote airport thrillers.

But Christie understood human nature in its myriad forms and she wrote accordingly: at times with brilliance.

It is this which Kenneth Branagh so fabulously unveils in his Murder on the Orient Express. Yes, he has assembled a world class cast of superstar actors, but it's Branagh himself, both as actor and Director,

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

who pulls the real meaning of this story out.

This is a tale of loss, sorry, unrequited grief and, above all, revenge. You don't get much more powerful emotions in human existence and these are wonderfully executed here.

It's fantastic, even if you know the plot. Go and see it and watch this wonderful tale again from a different perspective. Don't go just for light-hearted entertainment. It is that on one level. But it's also a tale which plumbs the depths of human existence: what Poirot calls 'the poison of deep grief.'

Fabulous film.

Rating: 161

4

Content: 161 , Size: 302

My wife and I looked so forward to seeing this movie. Unfortunately it was boring. No drama, no suspense. The cinematography was excellent. we actually saw people leave the cinema before the end of the movie. The star studded cast really don't shine. Very much a Sunday evening TV viewing movie.

Rating: 162

8

Content: 162 , Size: 2779

Fill a train with a most impressive cast line up, throw in a grisly murder mystery and have the mighty impressive Kenneth Branagh go on a quest to find out who done it and you got yourself a delightful little movie which will most certainly entertrain.

A take on Agatha Christie's popular novel Murder on the Orient Express, the story follows that of detective Hercule Poirot, who is called on business to London, and so takes the last available room on the Orient Express. Though wanting nothing more than to relax and enjoy his journey, he inadvertently finds himself working, when one of the passengers is mysteriously killed.

It's a wonderful simple story which sees detective Poirot go from guest to guest questioning them on their whereabouts on that fateful night. The opening scene did worry me somewhat with it's overly smart-arsed series of events, akin to that of a last few SHERLOCK TV episodes. It risked going off the rails and being too clever, well beyond believable, but thankfully for the main mystery it calms itself down.

The 1h 54min runtime steams by as I sat and enjoyed first class performances from all the cast. Stand out characters were Daisy Ridley's Miss Mary Debenham, Josh Gad's Hector MacQueen, Leslie Odom Jr.'s Dr. Arbuthnot and of course the brilliant Kenneth Branagh as the brilliantly quirky and intelligent Hercule Poirot. Only Michelle Pfeiffer's performance lacked somewhat and took away from what could have been a much more emotional scene towards the end.

For a story that takes place almost entirely on a train, the director

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

uses the limited space well, for as this narrative unfolds, it doesn't feel too claustrophobic, even in the narrow hallways and the tight compact cabins. Shifting the camera into creative perspectives at times helps keep the scenes fresh and visually stimulating (I especially enjoyed the birds eye view of the murder scene). The pacing is snappy and energetic and at no point feels like its running out of steam. Kenneth Branagh should also be commended for the way he juggles a story consisting of such a myriad of actors, by giving each character their own perspectives and motives, helps to keep the viewer on their toes; questioning every nuance and detail and while some are barely given any screen time, most feel substantially explored.

Overall Murder on the Orient Express conducts itself well, an interesting 'who done it?' mystery that will keep you guessing throughout. Wonderfully paced and fantastically performed. After something a bit different from your usual sci-fi/superhero adventure then this is just the ticket!

You can find more reviews like this over on my website:
www.popcornography.co.uk

Rating: 163

1

Content: 163 , Size: 348

DO NOT waste your money on this film. The script is bland, the CGI terrible, the acting bland and the directing a tour de force of Brannagh's egomania. Even his French accent was rubbish. I cannot believe how films like this ever get the money to get made. It was about as suspenseful as unleavened bread and deserves to simply be forgotten.

Rating: 164

1

Content: 164 , Size: 362

Worst film I have seen in my life 95% of it is just bullshit talking...

Few errors in the movie, waste of money.

I was expecting more out of it... than just pure talk.

Johnny Depp should of have played a better role than 15min...

Two other people that watched this film have left the cinema... that just shows how boring it can get.

Rating: 165

6

Content: 165 , Size: 1050

There's some outstanding points in this film namely

1) Kenneth Branagh - his portrayal of the world's greatest Belgian detective is the best I've seen by far

2) Cinematography- exceptional alpine backdrops . Hand-held camera-work

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

was exceptional

3) Casting - superb all star cast

But then there's the points that weren't so good

Some of script / delivery of lines was unintelligible

Some of the CGI was brilliant but some was quite poor and at one point the train looked like a child's toy! Also it felt a bit like the Polar express at times and that's over twelve years old !

Overall the film just could have been so much better it had all the ingredients , setting , cast , story but it failed to deliver a top notch performance. Shame really as I really looked forward to this and grudgingly paid the extra £4 for a reclining chair !

It sets itself up for DEATH ON THE NILE - I just hope that's a better rendition .

Pad.A 6.5/10

Rating: 166

5

Content: 166 , Size: 1111

Good: The amazing all-star cast of academy award winners. Even though each actor/actress plays their role well, no one was a standout. The setting of most of the movie is the Orient Express, which helps contribute to a trapped and isolated feel and makes you feel as if you were there with the detective. The introductory to Hercule Poirot is great, but as the movie chugs along

Bad: Overall, the movie lacks comedy and heartfelt moments. At times, the accent of Poirot is hard to understand, which leads to clues that are not clearly understood and a story that is hard to follow along. The movie is more of an interrogation of each character, by just going down the huge list of suspects and giving each character equal screen time. It progresses at a slow pace and the clues never lean me towards one person or another. I also did not find the murder to be inventive or creative.

Overall: Even with an outstanding cast, the movie suffers from a generic plot. The movie lacks the engaging aspects of a crime movie and relies too heavily on its cast to deliver its moments.

2.7/5

Rating: 167

1

Content: 167 , Size: 308

This is what happens when you give the Force Awakens raving reviews, you ruin cinema. Almost none of this endearing, the ensemble cast is not used well at all and perhaps not even considered much of a force save Brannagh. Johnny Depp is simply not good, Daisy Ridley is even worse. Terrible waste of time.

Rating: 168

10

Content: 168 , Size: 509

What a movie and what great acting. Frances McDormand has done amazing job and deserves awards for playing Mildred Hayes. Although a very serious subject, this movie is a comedy.

The punch lines are to the point and absolutely hilarious. I went to the Toronto International Film Festival to watch this movie and boy, do I consider myself lucky to have decided to watch it.

The story, screenplay, direction are amazing. After The Grand Budapest Hotel, this movie comes as a breath of fresh air.

Rating: 169

9

Content: 169 , Size: 2750

Having recently won the People's Choice Awards at TIFF, Three Billboards outside Ebbing, Missouri is very easy to see why it won.

Three Billboards is a dark but also funny and heart-felt story about one woman's quest to get justice for her daughter's rape and murder. After Mildred Haynes buys three billboards with words written on them accusing the town's well-liked sheriff of having not found her daughter's killer, it sets a series of events that turns the citizens and the cops against her.

The thing I can say about Three Billboards without going into spoilers is that it is wildly unpredictable. One moment you think things are going one direction as expected then it takes hard left turn that only adds to the dynamic between the characters. As the pressure within the town builds and anger is pointed towards Mildred, we see many of these characters evolve in order to deal with tragedy and grief and learn to find peace. And the movie goes through a roller-coaster of emotions. One moment you are laughing your butt off from the hilarious dialogue then you feel like someone just punched you in the gut. With every victory you think this story brings you feel like it was taken away from because of the world's unfairness and injustice. In lesser hands the mixture of dark and comedic tones would not work, but director and writer Martin McDonagh knows how to balance them to perfection.

The performances here just through the roof. Frances McDormand delivers a performance that will for sure get her into the Lead Actress awards race at the Oscars. As Mildred, McDormand just cuts loose with her performance with every line of hate, cynicism and cursing towards everyone she feels doesn't truly understand the internal pain she is going through. But McDormand does now and then show a soft side to Mildred. It shows that Mildred is just person like everyone who has her own way of dealing with the tragedy of losing her own child. And Sam Rockwell also gives one of the best performances of his career as the flawed and very misguided cop Dixon. The character of Dixon is short-tempered, volatile, and not bright with some baggage of his own that the locals accuse him of. But Sam Rockwell brings his charm and sincerity to what could be a rather unlikable character. And in the

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

latter half, you see Dixon go through a tremendous arc of learning to care about others rather than just being angry towards them. Other great performances that should be called out are Woody Harrelson, Peter Dinklage, John Hawk and Caleb Landry Jones.

Three Billboards outside Ebbing, Missouri is easily one of the best movies this year and is worth seeing once it comes out in wide releases.

Rating: 170

9

Content: 170 , Size: 1039

I watched this movie during the 2017 Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF) after it had won the Grolsch People's Choice Award. I already had high hopes for this movie and it definitely did not disappoint! Concept of the movie seems pretty easy to understand: Mildred Hayes (played by Frances McDormand) is still grieving the loss of her murdered daughter and challenges the local sheriff's (Woody Harrelson) inability to find her killer. From watching the trailer I was a little unsure if this was going to be a drama or a comedy, but turns out it was both, or more accurately a dark comedy. The first few minutes of the movie really set the tone for keeping you interested in the dramatic core, maintaining the humour in events as they unfold. Not only are the characters perfectly cast individually (example my fav Sam Rockwell as Officer Jason Dixon), but the writing of the entire script makes it so easy to enjoy this entire movie.

Writer/Director Martin McDonagh deserves a high five for this accomplishment!

Rating: 171

9

Content: 171 , Size: 2038

It seemed that the pregnant police detective Marge Gunderson from
Fargo
 would forever be the most memorable character of Frances McDormand's acting career. But now I'm not so sure. Mildred Hayes, the heroine from
Three Billboards
, is a serious contender. This might well be her best performance ever.

The part of Mildred Hayes was written with McDormand in mind. Hayes is a divorced single mother, living with her son on the outskirts of a small, remote town. She had a daughter too, but the girl was raped and killed on a quiet mountain road not far from home. Frustrated by the lack of progress of the investigation, Hayes decides to rent three dilapidated billboards, publicly accusing the local police chief of incompetence. By doing so, she attracts the attention of the media, angers almost the entire town and causes a succession of increasingly violent actions.

Although the film is about grief, anger, revenge and violence, it is

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

extremely funny. Above all because of Hayes's stubborn character and her ability to verbally humiliate people by her extremely sharp tongue. The monologue she delivers when a priest visits her house to tell her she has gone too far, is priceless.

Apart from McDormand's performance, the screenplay is another great feature of this film. The story is full of unexpected twists, gradually shifting the positions of the main characters towards each other. None of the characters are one-dimensional: they all reveal surprising parts of their personalities as the story moves forward.

And then there is the overall, almost Coen-esque atmosphere of a small town full of colourful characters. There is a racist cop, a friendly midget, a smart advertising guy and a pretty girl who is so dumb she doesn't know the difference between polo and polio.

It is hard to mention something negative about this film.
Three Billboards
 is, from start to finish, a great movie. I can't imagine anyone not enjoying it.

Rating: 172

10

Content: 172 , Size: 2093

I tried to write the summary of this movie for three days and still i have not found the correct words to connect them in order to make a sentence capable of expressing the quality of it. I have written the summary many times and i have erased in every occasion. So i decided to show some dots in the summary. That is the symbol of how excellent the movie is.

The plot :

The plot is very much uncommon. it has so many facts that it offers you a guessing 2 hour while you goes through the movie. It provides enough backbone to the rest of the element of the movie. It creates a concrete base upon which the movie stands firmly.

The mystery :

As the movie deals with a murder it contains enough mystery to shake the audiences. Scene after scene all this unpacked. But they have to wait till the end to solve the puzzles.

The resistance :

The movie is about the resistance of a mother. It starts with the desperate mission of a mother tobring the killers of her daughter to light. Those billboards, the sudden attacks, burgaining against the local authority.. all these are the part of a resistant mother which is also the part and parcel of the movie.

Acting :

Acting in my view is up to the mark. Frances McDormand is exquisite in her role as a mother seeking justice. Others have also come to the party.

Direction :

This is the characterstics of the movie i was most impressed with.

Although the plot and the acting is out of question but it is the director who has the sole credit to connect all this. He has slowly but cleverly unfolded all the sector available. He is good enough to make the movie what it looks like in the projector. He has turned the raw materials to a mature masterpiece.

Questions and answers :

last of all

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

the main event is the answers of the question that were aroused during the first session of the movie. You have to wait to find the answers. This waiting makes it more attractive.

So clearly it is a movie of great quality..a bit older type..but you know old is gold..

Rating: 173

9

Content: 173 , Size: 1111

Outstanding work by writer/director Martin McDonagh, in a return to form after the off-kilter "Seven Psychopaths." This film about the joint cul-de-sacs of loss and revenge. It is both horrifying and touching, and it is also very funny.

McDonagh, a first-rate playwright, knows how to structure scenes and write dialogue. To do him justice, first-rate actors are required. They must love the succulent stew of characters he cooks up, because he catches the very best.

I can't find enough superlatives for Frances McDormand and Sam Rockwell. They are, here as in everything they've ever been in, great. They are ably supported by Woody Harrelson, Caleb Landry Jones, Clarke Peters, Sandy Martin, Lucas Hedges, John Hawkes, Amanda Warren. The only weak link in this superb ensemble is Abbie Cornish, who is warm and smiley but is unfortunately out of her depth: a very odd piece of casting.

Cinematography, production design, costume, editing, music - they're all top of the range. But in the end it's down to McDormand and Rockwell, and the brilliant script.

Rating: 174

8

Content: 174 , Size: 536

I was almost afraid from watching the trailer that this would be one of those overwhelming movies because it involved dark and serious subject matter. I was pleasantly surprised that it was actually enjoyable because of the way it dealt with all the serious subjects. The script mixed just the right about of comedic relief (no, it isn't a comedy though there are some laugh out loud moments) with a compelling story. Each and every actor's performance was spot on for their character which helped make it well worth seeing!

Rating: 175

10

Content: 175 , Size: 2504

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is a dark comedy that has an a-list cast with names like Frances McDormand, Woody Harrelson, Sam

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

Rockwell, John Hawkes, and Peter Dinklage. It centers around Mildred Hayes, a woman whose daughter was raped and killed, and who believes that the local police have not done enough about it. In reaction, she erects three billboards outside of her town that send a message to the sheriff about the state of the investigation.

Writer/director Martin McDonagh (Seven Psychopaths, In Bruges) has outdone himself with this one. In my opinion, if this isn't one of the top Oscar contenders come awards season, then Hollywood has officially lost its mind.

Basically everything about this film works: from the acting, to the writing, to the direction. McDormand gives the performance of her career here, giving us humor through all the pain clearly shown on her face. Rockwell also gives his best performance here as a cop who isn't that bright and is more than a little racist.

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is probably the most unpredictable film of the year, and that's coming from a year that includes films like Baby Driver and Logan. There are scenes where you think that you know where the plot is going, but then midway through it completely flips the script.

For the entire run-time of this film, I was invested. It has the perfect run-time; it ends exactly when it needs to and there is not a scene that feels out of place.

It seems like one of the hardest things to do in film nowadays is to balance comedy and drama. However, this movie does it effortlessly. Each scene has just the right amount of comedy and drama, and sometimes, despite the fact that you're laughing, it's easy to forget that jokes are being made.

Also, the message that this film gives off resonates very powerfully with you after the film finishes. It makes you see the good side in humanity, despite our flaws. No character in this film is a cliché; one-dimensional shell of a person. Everybody has a reason for being there, which is more than some films recently have offered.

Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is easily one of the best and most enjoyable films of 2017, and it will make you laugh, cry, and think all in one sitting. There are not any clear flaws with this film that I can find, but I am still searching.

I give Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri an A+.

Rating: 176

10

Content: 176 , Size: 3644

It goes without saying that dark comedy is very difficult to accomplish. I would almost say it's harder to pull off than regular comedy because you need to be able to keep people invested in the dramatic aspect of the film, while still keeping them laughing throughout the majority of the duration. Director Martin McDonagh has matured as a filmmaker over the years, starting off with In Bruges,

which was pretty much a flat-out comedy, to Seven Psychopaths, which placed him a little further into the spotlight, but I must admit that Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is not only his best film to date, but also one of the best films I've received the pleasure of witnessing all year. From laughter to genuine tension and heart, this is a film that's pretty much perfect all around. Here is why I can recommend this film to everyone.

After the tragic death of her daughter, Mildred Hayes calls out the

local authorities on three billboards, publicly stating that they're not doing their jobs and not a single arrest has happened since the death of her daughter. While publicly displaying this is upsetting to some, she sees it as a point being made. Through some very cleverly written humor throughout the entire film, levity is brought to the table in times of sorrow, making this a very easy movie to watch. Although the story itself is quite depressing, this film is written in a way that will still find a way to make you smile.

From the very first few frames of this film, you can tell the tone will

be handled perfectly. Written and directed by Martin McDonagh with pure class, you can tell that he was very passionate when bringing this film to fruition. Every line of dialogue either progressed the story along, developed a character, made the audience laugh, or provided deep insight into the event of the murder itself. While not having the bearings of a conventional murder mystery, many viewers may not like the way this film concludes, but in the context of the movie as a whole and everything it's setting out to accomplish, it really does have a realistic and true finale.

It's arguable that some of the law enforcement officers play just as

significant a role as Mildred does throughout the film, being pretty much present every time a revelation occurs, but I gravitated the most towards Officer Dixon. I've always been a huge fan of Sam Rockwell, and his character here is one of the most essential to this story, set on being there from beginning to end, trying his absolute best to be of any help. While Woody Harrelson's portrayal of Chief Willoughby is by far the most important to the story at hand, it's the characters around him that drive him to his actions throughout the course of the movie. The characters are truly what make this film as likable as it is, and they're all wonderfully drawn.

Overall, when looking back on my experience watching Three Billboards

Outside Ebbing, Missouri, I find myself not being able to wait until its official theatrical release to watch it again. I found this film to be stellar in every sense of the word. From a noteworthy performance by Francis McDormand, devoted secondary performances, a screenplay that will have you consistently laughing, while also being emotionally involved with the serious storyline at hand, and pulling the audience in with its subtly composed score, everything about this film is worth praise. This was a huge surprise for me and I can't recommend you checking it out enough. Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri is a fantastic piece of modern cinema.

Rating: 177

9

Content: 177 , Size: 1109

Seen at the Viennale 2017: writing reviews about several movies in the last year, I nearly have to pass on this one. Three Billboards is of such high quality that it is nearly impossible to comment on it. Only highly professional reviewers should dare to write something about such high quality script, directing and cast. Why not ten stars, then? We still have to see, whether this one will become a classic movie for the Top 200. Maybe, it will. For sure it earns such a high rating. Three Billboards touches soul and heart from 10 minutes after the beginning up to the end. Seldom I changed from laughing to sadness in such a high frequency. But the movies greatest strength is: it gives hope. Hope in the possibility that people can change from the worse to the better. People are changing in this movie. People can change in real life. We get remembered that this is possible. For sure, I will never forget the highly emotional moment, when Dixon risks his life by grabbing the burning crime file of Hayes and jumps through the fire wall. This movie deserves every single Oscar it will (hopefully) get.

Rating: 178

9

Content: 178 , Size: 880

I won't even try and sum up all my feelings about this movie because no matter what I'd write, it wouldn't do it justice.

What I'll say is that it's brilliant, it's dark, it's hilarious - and not in a slapstick-funny-kind of way but in an authentic and real funny kind of way - and it transitions so effortlessly between that hilarity and despair that I was captivated throughout the entire film.

McDormand shines. Rockwell shines. Harrelson shines.

Everyone shines.

So far, for me, this has best screenplay, best actress in a leading roll and maybe even best actor in a supporting roll written all over it.

Every film lover is gonna talk about this gem in a couple of weeks/months and I'm sure that every film lover is gonna absolutely love this film.

Thank you, Martin McDonagh!

(9.1/10)

Rating: 179

7

Content: 179 , Size: 3900

In the words of poet Harivansh Rai Bachchan, the beauty of film is "You get poetic justice in less than 3 hours. You often don't get poetic justice in a lifetime." If that'd be the case than the collective works of Martin McDonagh serves as a counterweight to such thinking. His films, often involve looking in vain for the nebulous concepts of love,

justice and meaning in a post-modern world. His characters, likable if deeply flawed, shout into the void but never find the answers they seek.

Thus it's hard to truly gage a film like Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri. Much like In Bruges (2008) and Seven Psychopaths (2012), this film is rich with wit yet syncopated in its own world of messy loops, twists, turns and tones. The story begins with the melodies of Renee Fleming's "Tis the Last Rose of Summer"; but then ends the first five minutes on the screen in capital letters. The letters spell out "RAPED WHILE DYING," "STILL NO ARRESTS?" "HOW COME, CHIEF WILLOUGHBY". So starts the saga of the Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri, sanctioned by a grieving mother; printed for a dying man.

The mother in this case is Mildred Hayes (McDormand), who much like her billboards stands unwavering. She's hassled by everyone from Sheriff Willoughby's (Harrelson) clueless deputies to her ex-husband Charlie (Hawkes). Still, even when her son Robbie (Hedges) is incensed to give her the silent treatment, Mildred demands her message be heard. Her teenage daughter was raped and murdered seven long months ago and nothing has been done. She wants justice.

Yet the funny thing about justice in this movie is the moment you get a good handle on the concept, the film bleeds it away like water from outstretched hands. So too do the characters. Every time you get a firm understanding of who they are, something logical yet wholly unexpected forces you to assess and reassess. No one else best exemplifies this than Sam Rockwell's Office Dixon who goes from a racist Barney Fife to a numbed Travis Bickle with nary a dropped beat to make you question the change.

The ensemble carries the film through a lot of ugliness with grace. We glide uncomfortably close along the sharpened edges of rape, murder, abuse, suicide, alcoholism and racism. All the while questions like: "is it okay to be angry in an unfair world?" and "how do our decisions affect others," smear into the ashy black comedy and imposing melodrama. Deep care was given to breathe life into these characters. Even when someone as non-consequential as Charlie's nineteen-year-old girlfriend (Weaving) enters the fray you can't help but admire how these people interact and curious about how they must feel.

Martin McDonagh more than ever invites comparisons to the Coen brothers in this film. A signal that to me at least proves McDonagh is ambitious, but out of his weight class at this point in his career. For while the Coen's approach their films with the same character-first, free-form narratives, there's always a level of benevolence behind the cynicism. Here, instead of smirk-worthy amusement there is anger. Instead of cosmic curiosity there is more anger. Instead of wonder, there's just more anger, and you know what they say about anger; it just begets more anger.

If anger were the spice of life, then this murky soup would definitely

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

be worth consuming. But as it is not, regular filmgoers should approach this witty, richly rendered film with extreme caution. McDonagh's oeuvre is an acquired taste and those liable to agree with Bachchan's approach to film may walk out severely shook. But for those fixing for an overall decent barnstorming black comedy, the "Show Me" state might just have something for you.

Rating: 180

10

Content: 180 , Size: 1471

This movie first drew me in because it was an R Rated Black Comedy. As I have been on the lookout for them since watching the Voices, I happily settled to watch this movie. And it was a good thing I did. Firstly, the director, Martin McDonagh, is one of the best I've known, and he did not let me down with this film. He managed to display what he does best, creating a funny movie with a dark backstory. This was as heart moving as it was heart-wrenching. If you needed an example of an oxymoron, this would be the one. Funny and depressing, it tugs at your heartstrings whilst keeping you on a journey of laughter.

The cast, perfect. Being honest, I hadn't heard of Frances McDormand before. But after this film, I will never forget her. An amazing choice of the dead daughter mother figure, she's stubborn and great. Will be seeing more of her work in time to come. Woody Harrelson and Sam Rockwell have great on-screen chemistry. Unlike McDormand, I am a huge fan of Rockwell, loved his work in the Green Mile and Confessions of a Dangerous Mind and if you aren't a fan of him for whatever reason before this film, you will surely be one after. I'm surprised he managed to sneak in a few dance moves as well, he really stole the show.

So, if you are looking for something to brighten your day, I cannot recommend this enough. As I have said, one of the best dark comedies of our time. Please, watch it, you will not be let down.

Rating: 181

6

Content: 181 , Size: 1286

So far, this film has an IMDb rating of 8.3...and this is extraordinarily high. But the film has been in festivals and I am sure the rating will change some when the film is in general release. As for me, I think it's incredibly overrated.

The story is about an angry mom, Mildred (Frances McDormand). Her daughter was brutally murdered and raped...and the police haven't been able to do anything with the case. So, in desperation and anger, she rents out three billboards and calls the local Police Chief (Woody Harrelson) to task for this. Surprisingly, most of the town comes down against Mildred...who was just exercising her First Amendment rights. What happens from there...well, just see the film.

There were many wonderful

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

scenes and characters in this picture. But, there were also many main characters who were just god-awful and unlikable...including Mildred! In fact, later in the film when she thinks the police department has wronged her, she burns down the building and accidentally flames one of the cops! So, no one who is a main character in the film is nice or likable...making this movie a bit of a hard-sell. Too much cussing (even by 2017 standards), very crude language and overall nastiness prevent this one from being a must- see film.

Rating: 182

7

Content: 182 , Size: 1680

First off. Some people are calling this a horror movie. It is not. This is a mysterious drama-thriller with supernatural elements, and just the slightest hint of horror. Now, I expected this so it was OK, but be aware. Expectations is a movie worst enemy!

OK! So Thelma is beautifully shot. Thought has gone into each scene, and each camera angle. The movie overall is very calm, kinda quiet. Eili Harboe is excellent as the titular character. The other characters are good too, but she stands out. She has a very natural way of acting. Also she is beautiful, and so is Kaya Wilkins, which plays her new friend. Gorgeous people.

Like I said, Thelma is a calm, low key movie for the most part. I did think it dragged just a tad in the middle part, but both the beginning and ending is pretty good. It has certain romantic tendencies, but it was done in a not annoying way. Good.

There are some scenes with CGI here, and they are very well done. You almost won't notice they are CG, except from the fact that you know you are watching something impossible. That's good. Thelma is not heavy on big effect stuff, but the effects that are, are excellent.

Joachim Trier is Norwegian movie critics golden child. They love him over here. Personally I'm no big fan, but then again, Reprise is the only movie of his I've seen, so I can't really say. But Thelma is the kind of supernatural movie moviecritics are actually allowed to like. Because it's kinda artsy, ya'll! ;) Anyway, I liked it, didn't love it, but maybe I will later? I doubt it, but who knows! Know what you are in for, and you will probably like it too!

Rating: 183

8

Content: 183 , Size: 1821

Imagine a film that is part Carrie and part The Exorcist combined with a lesbian love story. I know that sounds a bit confusing but this is a pretty accurate summary of the picture.

When the story begins, young Thelma

(Eili Harboe) has gone off to college and things seem pretty normal. However, out of the blue, she has what appears to be a grand mal seizure that lands her in the hospital. Soon after, one of the folks who witnessed the seizure, Anja (Kaya Wilkens) introduces herself to Thelma and they soon become friends. In fact, over time they become more than friends as both the women begin having sexual feelings for each other…which causes Thelma to have a huge internal struggle because this violates her strong Christian upbringing. A bit later, Thelma enters the hospital for testing to determine exactly whether or not she has epilepsy. During the testing, her defenses are lowered and her intense feelings for Anya run wild…so wild that Thelma's supernatural powers manifest themselves. What exactly are these powers? And, what family secrets are there related to all this? And, how does this all end?

As I said, the story reminds me of a couple other films but it's also original in many ways. It also keeps you guessing…and that's the biggest reason I recommend the picture. Where all this is going and how it gets there make this a very special film, though I have a couple important warnings. First, there are lots and lots of flashing lights and epileptic viewers might have difficulties with this. Second, if you have a strong fear of snakes do not watch this film! There are several snakes in the film but one incredibly vivid dream that is nightmare fodder involving snakes and you need to consider this before you see this excellent movie.

Rating: 184

10

Content: 184 , Size: 591

Back from the cinema and i am still...wow wow wow.

It was just a kinda boring evening, so i took a walk to my favourite cinema in Reykjavik downtown spontaneous.

Unfortunately it was the smallest cinema hall but OK i took a set in the middle of the second seat row. So it was like the last seat row in the big cinema hall. Everything was quiet, not many peoples...perfect.

And the movie started, first scene, what the hell, OK, curious, interesting and from the beginning to the end, it was just stunning, stunning and stunning. The best movie 2017 i have seen so far!

Rating: 185

7

Content: 185 , Size: 1538

After reading the fantastic reviews and hearing from friends what a great film this was, i went in with big expectations. I was, oddly not to my surprise, a bit let down, and i think others will be too. But that doesn't mean that you shouldn't go out and watch it!

Harboe is the perfect choice for the titular character - every emotion

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

is portrayed with the utmost of believability. Her connection with Anja feels natural and at times entrancing. If Harboe doesn't win an Amanda for Best Actress i'll boycott the award show. Just saying...

The story is engaging, but slow-paced. I don't mind, others might. This is a beautiful piece of art, executed with finesse by Trier. The soundtrack is underscoring the action without adding too much drama, and you've gotta love every moment Susanne Sundfør's music is playing in the background. A perfect fit for this film. The screenplay has a lot of potential, but stumbles here and there. In a way i wish it had been a bit easier on the use of metaphors and symbolism, but at the same time i can't quite grasp what Thelma really is about. Visually, it's stunning - and that's not a given for Norwegian film. But film needs more than stunning photography, cinematography, characters, cgi and music. And that last bit is what's missing here.

Summed up: if you don't like Trier's other films, you might not like this one either. But it's worth the money (!) and your time. Film er best p#xE5; kino!

Rating: 186

10

Content: 186 , Size: 1293

Lights flicker, the wind rises and animals behave strangely when Thelma becomes agitated. She is capable of mysterious and ethereal powers, and more than she knows because her manipulative and fundamentalist parents keep such things under wraps in home-school. As Thelma heads to college in Oslo and stops taking medications, not only do her parents lose control, she loses control of herself. Psychogenic seizures rack her body. Passions and anxieties multiply along with her abilities. This is when Anja, Thelma's close friend, does something extremely upsetting for Thelma. The next day when Anja can't be found, Thelma has a sickening feeling she had something to do with it. She searches for answers to the secrets and powers that beguile and haunt her.

This thrilling, deep, complex and sensual film explores a whole realm of different theories and possibilities. I was surprised and delighted by its twists and turns. It crosses borders between reality and fantasy, and light and darkness, and explores the good and bad in human nature. The actors are amazing, especially Eili Harboe as Thelma and Kaya Wilkins as Anja. It is fantastic to discover that the roots of psychogenic disorders go back as far as Joan of Arc. Seen at the Toronto International Film Festival.

-1

('2017-11-05 13: 11: 36', 'nice', 10, '0')

nice

(10,)

9

0.5


```

1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 01', 'impossible', -10, '0')
impossible
(-10,)
-9
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'open', 10, '0')
open
(10,)
11
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'simple', 10, '0')
simple
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 41', 'basic', 10, '0')
basic
(10,)
11
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 42', 'too', 2.0, 0)
too
(2.0,)
4.0
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 37', 'creative', 10, '0')
creative
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'classic', 10, '0')
classic
(10,)
11
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 36', 'best', 10, '0')
best
(10,)
11
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'green', 10, '0')
green
(10,)
11

```

```

2.0
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'not', -1.0, 0)
not
(-1.0,)
-2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 16: 46: 49', 'bad', -11, '0')
bad
(-11,)
-10
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'really', 2.0, 0)
really
(2.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'good', 10, '0')
good
(10,)
11
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'not', -2.0, 0)
not
(-2.0,)
-4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'good', 11, '0')
good
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'happy', 10, '0')
happy
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'genuine', 10, '0')
genuine
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'quite', 2.0, 0)
quite
(2.0,)
4.0
1
('2017-11-05 16: 46: 49', 'very', 2.0, 0)
very

```

```

(2.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'good', 12, '0')
good
(12,)
13
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'so', 2.0, 0)
so
(2.0,)
4.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 52', 'dangerous', -10, '0')
dangerous
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 42', 'nice', 9, '0')
nice
(9,)
10
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'creative', 11, '0')
creative
(11,)
12
2.0
1
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 40', 'alive', 10, '0')
alive
(10,)
11
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'great', 10, '0')
great
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'sure', 10, '0')
sure
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'funny', 10, '0')
funny

```

```

(10,)
11
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'nice', 10, '0')
nice
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'not', -4.0, 0)
not
(-4.0,)
-8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'best', 11, '0')
best
(11,)
12
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'very', 4.0, 0)
Very
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'enjoyable', 10, '0')
enjoyable
(10,)
11
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 54', 'sick', -10, '0')
sick
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 13: 13: 00', 'twisted', -10, '0')
twisted
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'instant', 10, '0')
instant
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'classic', 11, '0')
classic
(11,)
12
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
1

```

```

1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'very', 2.0, 0)
very
(2.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'excited', 10, '0')
excited
(10,)
11
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 42', 'extremely', 2.0, 0)
extremely
(2.0,)
4.0
1
2.0
2.0
1
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'very', 4.0, 0)
very
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 36', 'awesome', 10, '0')
awesome
(10,)
11
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'very', 8.0, 0)
very
(8.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'amazing', 10, '0')
amazing
(10,)
11
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'happy', 11, '0')
happy
(11,)
12
2.0
2.0

```

```

1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'good', 13, '0')
good
(13,)
14
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'great', 11, '0')
great
(11,)
12
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 43', 'loud', -10, '0')
loud
(-10,)
-9
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 23', 'cheap', -10, '0')
cheap
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 30', 'dreadful', -10, '0')
dreadful
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 40', 'insidious', -10, '0')
insidious
(-10,)
-9
2.0
1
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'never', -1.0, 0)
never
(-1.0,)
-2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 42', 'especially', 2.0, 0)
especially
(2.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'good', 14, '0')
good
(14,)
15
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'incredible', 10, '0')

```

```

incredible
(10,)
11
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'alive', 11, '0')
alive
(11,)
12
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'not', -8.0, 0)
not
(-8.0,)
-16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'very', 16.0, 0)
very
(16.0,)
32.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 53', 'scary', -10, '0')
scary
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'smart', 10, '0')
smart
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'fun', 10, '0')
fun
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 36', 'cool', 10, '0')
cool
(10,)
11
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'so', 4.0, 0)
so
(4.0,)
8.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'not', -16.0, 0)
not
(-16.0,)
-32.0
('2017-11-05 16: 46: 49', 'worst', -11, '0')
worst
(-11,)

```

```

-10
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'not', -32.0, 0)
not
(-32.0,)
-64.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'best', 12, '0')
best
(12,)
13
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'best', 13, '0')
best
(13,)
14
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'never', -2.0, 0)
never
(-2.0,)
-4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'so', 8.0, 0)
so
(8.0,)
16.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'too', 4.0, 0)
too
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'so', 16.0, 0)
so
(16.0,)
32.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'happy', 12, '0')
happy
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'good', 15, '0')
good
(15,)
16
2.0
1
-1
-1

```



```

-1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 19', 'awful', -10, '0')
awful
(-10,)
-11
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'whole', 10, '0')
whole
(10,)
9
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'not', -64.0, 0)
not
(-64.0,)
-32.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'very', 32.0, 0)
very
(32.0,)
64.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'whole', 9, '0')
whole
(9,)
10
1
1
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'good', 16, '0')
good
(16,)
17
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'not', -32.0, 0)
not
(-32.0,)
-64.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'great', 12, '0')
great
(12,)
13
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'not', -64.0, 0)
not
(-64.0,)
-128.0

```

```

2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 41', 'complete', 10, '0')
complete
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'not', -128.0, 0)
not
(-128.0,)
-256.0
1
1
2.0
1
1
2.0
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'good', 17, '0')
good
(17,)
18
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'remarkable', 10, '0')
remarkable
(10,)
11
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'too', 8.0, 0)
too
(8.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 26', 'dead', -10, '0')
dead
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'lucky', 10, '0')
lucky
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'dead', -9, '0')

```

```

dead
(-9,)
-8
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'pretty', 10, '0')
pretty
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'bad', -10, '0')
bad
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'lucky', 11, '0')
lucky
(11,)
12
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 35', 'gruesome', -10, '0')
gruesome
(-10,)
-9
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'not', -256.0, 0)
not
(-256.0,)
-512.0
1
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'too', 16.0, 0)
too
(16.0,)
32.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 21', 'bloody', -10, '0')
bloody
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'best', 14, '0')
best
(14,)
15
2.0
2.0

```

```

2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 37', 'brilliant', 10, '0')
brilliant
(10,)
11
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 25', 'critic', -10, '0')
critic
(-10,)
-9
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'not', -512.0, 0)
not
(-512.0,)
-1024.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 47', 'outrageous', -10, '0')
outrageous
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'not', -1024.0, 0)
not
(-1024.0,)
-2048.0
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 37', 'horrible', -10, '0')
horrible
(-10,)
-11
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'not', -2048.0, 0)
not
(-2048.0,)
-1024.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'good', 18, '0')
good
(18,)
17
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 36', 'better', 10, '0')
better
(10,)
9
-1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'rarely', 0.5, 0)

```

```

rarely
(0.5,)
1.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'highest', 10, '0')
highest
(10,)
11
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'bad', -9, '0')
bad
(-9,)
-8
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'better', 9, '0')
better
(9,)
10
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'bad', -8, '0')
bad
(-8,)
-7
2.0
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'so', 32.0, 0)
so
(32.0,)
64.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'happy', 13, '0')
happy
(13,)
14
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'brilliant', 11, '0')
brilliant
(11,)
12
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'bad', -7, '0')
bad
(-7,)
-6

```

```

2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'not', -1024.0, 0)
not
(-1024.0,)
-2048.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'quite', 4.0, 0)
quite
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'unique', 10, '0')
unique
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'very', 64.0, 0)
very
(64.0,)
128.0
1
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'brilliant', 12, '0')
brilliant
(12,)
13
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'not', -2048.0, 0)
not
(-2048.0,)
-4096.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'too', 32.0, 0)
too
(32.0,)
64.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'sure', 11, '0')
sure
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'bad', -6, '0')
bad
(-6,)
-5
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'really', 4.0, 0)
really

```

```

(4.0,)
8.0
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'simple', 11, '0')
simple
(11,)
12
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 42', 'completely', 2.0, 0)
completely
(2.0,)
4.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 42', 'entirely', 2.0, 0)
entirely
(2.0,)
4.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 42', 'absolutely', 2.0, 0)
absolutely
(2.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'thoroughly', 2.0, 0)
thoroughly
(2.0,)
4.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'interested', 10, '0')
interested
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'so', 64.0, 0)
so
(64.0,)
128.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'great', 13, '0')
great
(13,)
14
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'gorgeous', 10, '0')
gorgeous

```

```

(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'not', -4096.0, 0)
not
(-4096.0,)
-8192.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'whole', 10, '0')
whole
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'not', -8192.0, 0)
not
(-8192.0,)
-16384.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'favorite', 10, '0')
favorite
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'fantastic', 10, '0')
fantastic
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 22', 'boring', -10, '0')
boring
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'so', 128.0, 0)
so
(128.0,)
256.0
1
1
2.0
1
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'best', 15, '0')
best
(15,)
16
2.0

```


IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'not', -16384.0, 0)
not
(-16384.0,)
-32768.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'brilliant', 13, '0')
brilliant
(13,)
14
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 52', 'not', -32768.0, 0)
not
(-32768.0,)
-65536.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'boring', -9, '0')
boring
(-9,)
-8
0.5
-1
-1
-1
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 52', 'not', -65536.0, 0)
not
(-65536.0,)
-32768.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'proud', 10, '0')
proud
(10,)
9
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
0.5
-1
-1
-1
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 52', 'not', -32768.0, 0)

```

not
(-32768.0,)
-16384.0
0.5
-1
-1
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 37', 'easy', 10, '0')
easy
(10,)
9
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 52', 'best', 16, '0')
best
(16,)
17
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'scary', -9, '0')
scary
(-9,)
-8
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'funny', 11, '0')
funny
(11,)
12
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 55', 'disappointing', -10, '0')
disappointing
(-10,)
-9
2.0
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'great', 14, '0')
great
(14,)
15
2.0
1
2.0
1
1

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'simple', 12, '0')
simple
(12,)
13
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'classic', 12, '0')
classic
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 50', 'complicated', -10, '0')
complicated
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'great', 15, '0')
great
(15,)
16
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'legendary', 10, '0')
legendary
(10,)
11
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'open', 11, '0')
open
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'really', 8.0, 0)
really
(8.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'good', 17, '0')
good
(17,)
18
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'really', 16.0, 0)
really
(16.0,)
32.0
-1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'too', 64.0, 0)
too
(64.0,)
32.0
-1

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'very', 128.0, 0)
very
(128.0,)
64.0
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'whole', 11, '0')
whole
(11,)
10
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'very', 64.0, 0)
very
(64.0,)
32.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 52', 'not', -16384.0, 0)
not
(-16384.0,)
-8192.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'genuine', 11, '0')
genuine
(11,)
10
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'not', -8192.0, 0)
not
(-8192.0,)
-4096.0
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'not', -4096.0, 0)
not
(-4096.0,)
-2048.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'easy', 9, '0')
easy
(9,)
8
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'not', -2048.0, 0)
not
(-2048.0,)
-1024.0
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'not', -1024.0, 0)
not
(-1024.0,)
-512.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'interesting', 10, '0')

```

```

interesting
(10,)
9
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'funny', 12, '0')
funny
(12,)
11
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'bad', -5, '0')
bad
(-5,)
-6
0.5
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'not', -512.0, 0)
not
(-512.0,)
-256.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'funny', 11, '0')
funny
(11,)
10
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 57', 'stupid', -10, '0')
stupid
(-10,)
-11
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 21', 'bloated', -10, '0')
bloated
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'bad', -6, '0')
bad
(-6,)
-7
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'so', 256.0, 0)
so
(256.0,)
128.0
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'good', 18, '0')
good
(18,)

```

```

17
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 36', 'hard', -10, '0')
hard
(-10,)
-11
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'free', 10, '0')
free
(10,)
9
0.5
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'not', -256.0, 0)
not
(-256.0,)
-128.0
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'full', 10, '0')
full
(10,)
9
0.5
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'not', -128.0, 0)
not
(-128.0,)
-64.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'best', 17, '0')
best
(17,)
16
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'not', -64.0, 0)
not
(-64.0,)
-32.0
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'funny', 10, '0')
funny
(10,)
9
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'not', -32.0, 0)
not
(-32.0,)

```

```

-16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'best', 16, '0')
best
(16,)
15
0.5
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'too', 32.0, 0)
too
(32.0,)
16.0
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'not', -16.0, 0)
not
(-16.0,)
-8.0
0.5
0.5
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'so', 128.0, 0)
so
(128.0,)
64.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'hard', -11, '0')
hard
(-11,)
-12
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'almost', 0.5, 0)
almost
(0.5,)
0.25
0.5
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'very', 32.0, 0)
very
(32.0,)
16.0
-1

```

```

-1
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 06', 'negative', -10, '0')
negative
(-10,)
-11
-1
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'funny', 9, '0')
funny
(9,)
8
-1
-1
-1
2.0
1
1
2.0
2.0
1
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'not', -8.0, 0)
not
(-8.0,)
-16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'not', -16.0, 0)
not
(-16.0,)
-32.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'special', 10, '0')
special
(10,)
9
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'fantastic', 11, '0')
fantastic
(11,)
10
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'so', 64.0, 0)
so
(64.0,)
32.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'bad', -7, '0')
bad
(-7,)

```



```

-8
0.5
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'loud', -9, '0')
loud
(-9,)
-10
-1
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'not', -32.0, 0)
not
(-32.0,)
-16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'so', 32.0, 0)
so
(32.0,)
16.0
-1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'bad', -8, '0')
bad
(-8,)
-9
-1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'so', 16.0, 0)
so
(16.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'bad', -9, '0')
bad
(-9,)
-10
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 40', 'strong', 10, '0')
strong
(10,)
9
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'dead', -8, '0')
dead
(-8,)
-9

```

-1
 -1
 -1
 -1
 -1
 -1
 0.5
 -1
 -1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'strong', 9, '0')
 strong
 (9,)
 8
 -1
 -1
 0.5
 ('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'precious', 10, '0')
 precious
 (10,)
 9
 -1
 -1
 -1
 0.5
 ('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'not', -16.0, 0)
 Not
 0.5
 0.5
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 49', 'propaganda', -10, '0')
 propaganda
 (-10,)
 -11
 -1
 0.5
 ('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'so', 8.0, 0)
 so
 (8.0,)
 4.0
 0.5
 1
 1
 1
 1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'negative', -11, '0')
 negative
 (-11,)
 -10
 1

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 55', 'sloppy', -10, '0')
sloppy
(-10,)
-9
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'very', 16.0, 0)
very
(16.0,)
32.0
1
1
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'enjoyable', 11, '0')
enjoyable
(11,)
12
2.0
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'not', 0.5, 0)
not
(0.5,)
1.0
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'okay', 10, '0')
okay
(10,)
11
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'nice', 11, '0')
nice
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'special', 9, '0')
special
(9,)
10
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'better', 10, '0')
better
(10,)

```

```

11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 58', 'not', 1.0, 0)
not
(1.0,)
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'natural', 10, '0')
natural
(10,)
11
2.0
1
1
1
1
2.0
1
2.0
1
1
1
2.0
2.0
1
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'funny', 8, '0')
funny
(8,)
9
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'really', 32.0, 0)
really
(32.0,)
64.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'really', 64.0, 0)
really
(64.0,)
128.0
1
2.0

```

```

1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'natural', 11, '0')
natural
(11,)
12
1
1
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 58', 'so', 4.0, 0)
so
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'good', 17, '0')
good
(17,)
18
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'not', 2.0, 0)
not
(2.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'best', 15, '0')
best
(15,)
16
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'good', 18, '0')
good
(18,)
19
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'really', 128.0, 0)
really
(128.0,)
256.0
1
1
1
2.0
1
1
2.0
1
1
1

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'not', 4.0, 0)
not
(4.0,)
8.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'impressive', 10, '0')
impressive
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'impressive', 11, '0')
impressive
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 36', 'beautiful', 10, '0')
beautiful
(10,)
11
1
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'not', 8.0, 0)
not
(8.0,)
16.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'great', 16, '0')
great
(16,)
17
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'right', 10, '0')
right
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'especially', 4.0, 0)
especially
(4.0,)
8.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 58', 'special', 10, '0')
special
(10,)
11

```

```

2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'impressive', 12, '0')
impressive
(12,)
13
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'natural', 12, '0')
natural
(12,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'not', 16.0, 0)
not
(16.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 58', 'very', 32.0, 0)
very
(32.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'good', 19, '0')
good
(19,)
18
0.5
0.5
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'natural', 11, '0')
natural
(11,)
10
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 24', 'cold', -10, '0')
cold
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'so', 8.0, 0)
so
(8.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'full', 9, '0')
full
(9,)
8
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 47', 'never', -4.0, 0)

```

```

never
(-4.0,)
-2.0
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'full', 8, '0')
full
(8,)
7
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'not', 8.0, 0)
not
(8.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'best', 16, '0')
best
(16,)
15
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'full', 7, '0')
full
(7,)
6
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'loud', -10, '0')
loud
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 39', 'perfect', 10, '0')
perfect
(10,)
9
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 52', 'rubbish', -10, '0')
rubbish
(-10,)
-9
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'good', 18, '0')
good
(18,)

```



```

19
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'excellent', 10, '0')
excellent
(10,)
11
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 23', 'cheesy', -10, '0')
cheesy
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'slightly', 0.5, 0)
slightly
(0.5,)
1.0
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'good', 19, '0')
good
(19,)
20
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'not', 4.0, 0)
not
(4.0,)
8.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'great', 17, '0')
great
(17,)
18
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'really', 256.0, 0)
really
(256.0,)
512.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'good', 20, '0')
good
(20,)
21
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'really', 512.0, 0)
really
(512.0,)
1024.0

```

```

1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'strong', 8, '0')
strong
(8,)
9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'special', 11, '0')
special
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'cheesy', -9, '0')
cheesy
(-9,)
-8
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'best', 15, '0')
best
(15,)
16
2.0
1
1
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 58', 'nice', 12, '0')
nice
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'too', 16.0, 0)
too
(16.0,)
32.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'so', 4.0, 0)
So
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'very', 16.0, 0)
very
(16.0,)
8.0
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'very', 8.0, 0)
Very
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'cheesy', -8, '0')
cheesy
(-8,)
-9

```

```

-1
-1
-1
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'really', 1024.0, 0)
really
(1024.0,)
512.0
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 17', 'wrong', -10, '0')
wrong
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'bad', -10, '0')
bad
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'stupid', -11, '0')
Stupid
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'bad', -11, '0')
bad
(-11,)
-12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'really', 512.0, 0)
really
(512.0,)
256.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 53', 'shallow', -10, '0')
shallow
(-10,)
-11
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'bad', -12, '0')
bad
(-12,)
-13
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'really', 256.0, 0)
Really
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 55', 'free', 9, '0')
free
(9,)
8
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'bad', -13, '0')

```

```

bad
(-13,)
-14
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'really', 0.5, 0)
really
(0.5,)
0.25
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'bad', -14, '0')
bad
(-14,)
-15
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'really', 0.25, 0)
really
(0.25,)
0.125
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'shallow', -11, '0')
shallow
(-11,)
-12
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'special', 12, '0')
special
(12,)
11
-1
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 58', 'better', 11, '0')
better
(11,)
10
-1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 09', 'poor', -10, '0')
poor
(-10,)
-11
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'better', 10, '0')
better
(10,)
9

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

```
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'dreadful', -9, '0')
dreadful
(-9,)
-10
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'special', 11, '0')
special
(11,)
10
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'bad', -15, '0')
bad
(-15,)
-16
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'nice', 13, '0')
nice
(13,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'cool', 11, '0')
cool
(11,)
10
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'lovely', 10, '0')
lovely
(10,)
9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'not', 8.0, 0)
not
(8.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'great', 18, '0')
great
(18,)
17
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'great', 17, '0')
great
(17,)
16
-1
0.5
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'so', 2.0, 0)
so
(2.0,)
1.0
```

```

-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'bad', -16, '0')
bad
(-16,)
-17
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'good', 21, '0')
good
(21,)
20
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 04', 'really', 0.125, 0)
really
(0.125,)
0.0625
-1
0.5
-1
-1
0.5
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 58', 'tacky', -10, '0')
tacky
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'genuine', 10, '0')
genuine
(10,)
9
0.5
-1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'whole', 10, '0')
whole
(10,)
9
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'so', 1.0, 0)
so
(1.0,)
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'almost', 0.25, 0)
almost
(0.25,)

```

0.125
 -1
 -1
 -1
 0.5
 -1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'very', 0.5, 0)
 very
 (0.5,)
 0.25
 -1
 0.5
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 30', 'dumb', -10, '0')
 dumb
 (-10,)
 -11
 -1
 -1
 -1
 0.5
 -1
 -1
 ('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'utterly', 2.0, 0)
 utterly
 (2.0,)
 1.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'bad', -17, '0')
 bad
 (-17,)
 -18
 0.5
 -1
 0.5
 ('2017-11-05 17: 17: 57', 'dead', -9, '0')
 DEAD
 -1
 -1
 -1
 -1
 -1
 -1
 -1
 -1
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 55', 'sorry', -10, '0')
 sorry
 (-10,)
 -11
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 58', 'terrible', -10, '0')

```

terrible
(-10,)
-11
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 17', 'weak', -10, '0')
weak
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'not', 4.0, 0)
not
(4.0,)
8.0
1
2.0
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 07', 'not', 8.0, 0)
not
(8.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 06', 'so', 0.5, 0)
so
(0.5,)
1.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 06', 'very', 0.25, 0)
very
(0.25,)
0.5
1
1
1
1
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'fantastic', 10, '0')
fantastic
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 07', 'fantastic', 11, '0')
fantastic
(11,)
12

```



```

2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'special', 10, '0')
special
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'great', 16, '0')
great
(16,)
17
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'wise', 10, '0')
wise
(10,)
9
0.5
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'poor', -11, '0')
poor
(-11,)
-12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'good', 20, '0')
good
(20,)
19
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 08', 'good', 19, '0')
good
(19,)
18
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 07', 'not', 16.0, 0)
not
(16.0,)
8.0
0.5
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
-1
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 08', 'not', 8.0, 0)
not
(8.0,)
4.0
0.5

```

-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 07', 'so', 1.0, 0)
so
(1.0,)
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 00', 'flawed', -10, '0')
flawed
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 46', 'nefarious', -10, '0')
nefarious
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'horrible', -11, '0')
Horrible
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 08', 'so', 0.5, 0)
so
(0.5,)
0.25
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 59', 'tired', -10, '0')
tired
(-10,)
-11
-1
-1
-1
0.5
-1
-1
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 17', 'absurd', -10, '0')
absurd
(-10,)
-11
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
0.5
0.5
0.5
-1
-1
-1
-1

```

-1
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 28', 'die', -10, '0')
die
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 56', 'hard', -12, '0')
hard
(-12,)
-13
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 43', 'lunatic', -10, '0')
lunatic
(-10,)
-11
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 08', 'good', 18, '0')
good
(18,)
19
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'phenomenal', 10, '0')
phenomenal
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 09', 'good', 19, '0')
good
(19,)
20
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 54', 'silly', -10, '0')
silly
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 55', 'disaster', -10, '0')
disaster
(-10,)
-9
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'good', 20, '0')
good
(20,)
21
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'better', 9, '0')
better
(9,)
10

```

1
 1
 2.0
 2.0
 1
 ('2017-11-05 13: 11: 41', 'certain', 10, '0')
 certain
 (10,)
 11
 1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 08', 'not', 4.0, 0)
 not
 (4.0,)
 8.0
 1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'best', 16, '0')
 best
 (16,)
 17
 1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 07', 'very', 0.5, 0)
 very
 (0.5,)
 1.0
 2.0
 1
 1
 2.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 17: 59', 'funny', 9, '0')
 funny
 (9,)
 10
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'nice', 12, '0')
 nice
 (12,)
 13
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'good', 21, '0')
 good
 (21,)
 22
 2.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'not', 8.0, 0)
 not
 (8.0,)
 16.0
 2.0
 1
 2.0

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'very', 1.0, 0)
very
(1.0,)
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'good', 22, '0')
good
(22,)
23
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'really', 0.0625, 0)
really
(0.0625,)
0.125
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'cool', 10, '0')
cool
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 09', 'so', 0.25, 0)
so
(0.25,)
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 06', 'genuine', 9, '0')
genuine
(9,)
10
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 58', 'negative', -10, '0')
negative
(-10,)
-9
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 55', 'difficult', -10, '0')
difficult
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'beautiful', 11, '0')
beautiful
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'good', 23, '0')
good
(23,)
24
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'very', 2.0, 0)
very
(2.0,)
4.0

```

```

1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'not', 16.0, 0)
not
(16.0,)
32.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'not', 32.0, 0)
not
(32.0,)
64.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'fair', 10, '0')
fair
(10,)
11
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'very', 4.0, 0)
very
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'good', 24, '0')
good
(24,)
25
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'so', 0.5, 0)
so
(0.5,)
1.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'funny', 10, '0')
funny
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'too', 32.0, 0)
too
(32.0,)
64.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'very', 8.0, 0)
very
(8.0,)
16.0
2.0
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'stunning', 10, '0')
stunning
(10,)
9

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

-1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 49', 'catastrophic', -10, '0')
catastrophic
(-10,)
-11
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'full', 6, '0')
full
(6,)
5
-1
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'reasonable', 10, '0')
reasonable
(10,)
9
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 41', 'intense', -10, '0')
intense
(-10,)
-11
0.5
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'good', 25, '0')
good
(25,)
24
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'best', 17, '0')
Best
1
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'nice', 13, '0')
nice
(13,)
14
1
1
1
1
2.0
2.0

```

1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 24', 'clunky', -10, '0')
clunky
(-10,)
-9
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'not', 64.0, 0)
not
(64.0,)
128.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'so', 1.0, 0)
so
(1.0,)
2.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'enjoyed', 10, '0')
enjoyed
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'strong', 9, '0')
strong
(9,)
10
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'strong', 10, '0')
strong
(10,)
11
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'hugely', 2.0, 0)
hugely
(2.0,)
4.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 08', 'special', 11, '0')
special
(11,)
12
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 12', 'good', 24, '0')
good
(24,)
25

```


IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

```

2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'too', 64.0, 0)
too
(64.0,)
128.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 12', 'not', 128.0, 0)
not
(128.0,)
256.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'good', 25, '0')
good
(25,)
26
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 15', 'unjust', -10, '0')
unjust
(-10,)
-9
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'basic', 11, '0')
basic
(11,)
12
1
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 06', 'bad', -18, '0')
bad
(-18,)
-17
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'bad', -17, '0')
bad
(-17,)
-16
1
1
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'natural', 10, '0')
natural
(10,)

```

```

11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'not', 256.0, 0)
not
(256.0,)
512.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'really', 0.125, 0)
really
(0.125,)
0.25
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 12', 'so', 2.0, 0)
so
(2.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'not', 512.0, 0)
not
(512.0,)
1024.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'really', 0.25, 0)
really
(0.25,)
0.5
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'so', 4.0, 0)
so
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'better', 10, '0')
Better
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'so', 8.0, 0)
so
(8.0,)
16.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 41', 'calm', 10, '0')
calm
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'neat', 10, '0')
neat
(10,)
11
2.0

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

```
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
1
2.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'good', 26, '0')
good
(26,)
27
2.0
1
2.0
1
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'super', 10, '0')
super
(10,)
11
2.0
1
1
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'funny', 11, '0')
funny
(11,)
12
1
1
2.0
2.0
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 41', 'clever', 10, '0')
clever
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'really', 0.5, 0)
```

```

really
(0.5,)
1.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'sure', 12, '0')
sure
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 25', 'crazy', -10, '0')
crazy
(-10,)
-9
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 08', 'great', 17, '0')
great
(17,)
18
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 40', 'tremendous', 10, '0')
tremendous
(10,)
11
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'not', 1024.0, 0)
not
(1024.0,)
2048.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 55', 'disappointed', -10, '0')
disappointed
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'great', 18, '0')
great
(18,)
19
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'very', 16.0, 0)
very
(16.0,)
32.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 39', 'satisfied', 10, '0')
satisfied
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'negative', -9, '0')
negative

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

```
(-9,)
-8
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'not', 2048.0, 0)
not
(2048.0,)
4096.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'not', 4096.0, 0)
not
(4096.0,)
8192.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'not', 8192.0, 0)
not
(8192.0,)
16384.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'light', 10, '0')
light
(10,)
11
1
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'happy', 14, '0')
Happy
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'fun', 11, '0')
fun
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'too', 128.0, 0)
too
(128.0,)
256.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 12', 'best', 1, '0')
best
(1,)
2
1
2.0
1
1
2.0
```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'bad', -16, '0')
bad
(-16,)
-15
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 08', 'fantastic', 12, '0')
fantastic
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'excellent', 11, '0')
excellent
(11,)
12
1
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
2.0
1
1
1
2.0
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'smart', 11, '0')
smart
(11,)
12
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'happy', 1, '0')
Happy
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'sure', 13, '0')
sure
(13,)
14
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'favorite', 11, '0')
favorite
(11,)
12
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'very', 32.0, 0)

```

```

very
(32.0,)
64.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'clever', 11, '0')
clever
(11,)
12
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'not', 16384.0, 0)
not
(16384.0,)
32768.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'classic', 13, '0')
classic
(13,)
14
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 01', 'never', -2.0, 0)
never
(-2.0,)
-4.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 30', 'dubious', -10, '0')
dubious
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'great', 19, '0')
great
(19,)
20
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'not', 32768.0, 0)
not
(32768.0,)
65536.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'sure', 14, '0')
sure
(14,)
15
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'funny', 12, '0')
funny

```

```

(12,)
13
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 25', 'dark', -10, '0')
dark
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'so', 16.0, 0)
so
(16.0,)
32.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'really', 1.0, 0)
really
(1.0,)
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'right', 11, '0')
right
(11,)
12
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'quiet', 10, '0')
quiet
(10,)
11
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'young', 10, '0')
young
(10,)
11
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'happy', 1, '0')
Happy
1
2.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'aware', 10, '0')
aware
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'familiar', 10, '0')
familiar

```



```

(10,)
11
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'good', 27, '0')
good
(27,)
28
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'impressed', 10, '0')
impressed
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'fully', 2.0, 0)
fully
(2.0,)
4.0
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'fully', 4.0, 0)
fully
(4.0,)
8.0
1
2.0
1
1
2.0
1
2.0
1
1
1
1
1
1
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'fresh', 10, '0')
fresh
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'happy', 1, '0')

```

Happy
 1
 1
 2.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'cheesy', -9, '0')
 cheesy
 (-9,)
 -8
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'right', 12, '0')
 right
 (12,)
 13
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'very', 64.0, 0)
 very
 (64.0,)
 128.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'very', 128.0, 0)
 very
 (128.0,)
 256.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'fun', 12, '0')
 fun
 (12,)
 13
 2.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'not', 65536.0, 0)
 not
 (65536.0,)
 131072.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'very', 256.0, 0)
 very
 (256.0,)
 512.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'scary', -8, '0')
 scary
 (-8,)
 -7
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 13', 'tense', -10, '0')
 tense
 (-10,)
 -9
 2.0
 2.0
 1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'good', 28, '0')
 good
 (28,)
 29

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'best', 2, '0')
best
(2,)
3
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'not', 131072.0, 0)
not
(131072.0,)
262144.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'very', 512.0, 0)
very
(512.0,)
1024.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'smart', 12, '0')
smart
(12,)
13
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'very', 1024.0, 0)
very
(1024.0,)
2048.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 40', 'satisfying', 10, '0')
satisfying
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 05', 'misleading', -10, '0')
misleading
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'happy', 1, '0')
Happy
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'rarely', 1.0, 0)
rarely
(1.0,)
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'interested', 11, '0')
interested
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'funny', 13, '0')

```

```

funny
(13,)
14
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'too', 256.0, 0)
too
(256.0,)
512.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 12', 'nice', 14, '0')
nice
(14,)
15
1
1
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'very', 2048.0, 0)
very
(2048.0,)
4096.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'better', 1, '0')
better
(1,)
2
1
1
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'good', 29, '0')
good
(29,)
30
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'really', 2.0, 0)
really
(2.0,)
4.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 36', 'able', 10, '0')
able
(10,)

```

```

11
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'able', 11, '0')
able
(11,)
12
2.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'happy', 1, '0')
Happy
1
1
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'good', 30, '0')
good
(30,)
31
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 24', 'crafty', -10, '0')
crafty
(-10,)
-9
2.0
2.0
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'better', 2, '0')
better
(2,)
3
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'so', 32.0, 0)
so
(32.0,)
64.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'so', 64.0, 0)
so
(64.0,)
128.0
2.0
2.0
2.0

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 06', 'whole', 9, '0')
whole
(9,)
10
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'incredibly', 2.0, 0)
incredibly
(2.0,)
4.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'good', 31, '0')
good
(31,)
32
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'fair', 11, '0')
fair
(11,)
12
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'capable', 10, '0')
capable
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'so', 128.0, 0)
so
(128.0,)
256.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'not', 262144.0, 0)
not
(262144.0,)
524288.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'fantastic', 13, '0')
fantastic
(13,)
14
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'incredibly', 4.0, 0)
incredibly
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 06', 'dumb', -11, '0')
dumb
(-11,)
-10
2.0
2.0

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

```

('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'stupid', -1, '0')
stupid
(-1,)
0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'good', 32, '0')
good
(32,)
33
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 10', 'certain', 11, '0')
certain
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'somewhat', 0.5, 0)
somewhat
(0.5,)
1.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 39', 'popular', 10, '0')
popular
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'completely', 4.0, 0)
completely
(4.0,)
8.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 41', 'curious', 10, '0')
curious
(10,)
11
1
1
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 17', 'weaker', -10, '0')
weaker
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 13: 13: 01', 'unknown', -10, '0')
unknown
(-10,)
-9
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'perfect', 9, '0')
perfect

```

```

(9,)
10
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 36', 'attractive', 10, '0')
attractive
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'better', 3, '0')
better
(3,)
4
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 41', 'constant', 10, '0')
constant
(10,)
11
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'really', 4.0, 0)
really
(4.0,)
8.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'fine', 10, '0')
fine
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'cheap', -9, '0')
cheap
(-9,)
-8
1
2.0
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'barely', 0.5, 0)
barely
(0.5,)
1.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'so', 256.0, 0)
so
(256.0,)
512.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'stupid', 0, '0')
stupid

```



```

(0,)
1
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'fine', 11, '0')
fine
(11,)
12
1
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'good', 33, '0')
good
(33,)
34
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 53', 'selfish', -10, '0')
selfish
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 56', 'spoiled', -10, '0')
spoiled
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 09', 'lunatic', -11, '0')
lunatic
(-11,)
-10
('2017-11-05 13: 13: 01', 'unusual', -10, '0')
unusual
(-10,)
-9
2.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'fully', 8.0, 0)
fully
(8.0,)
16.0

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

```
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 13', 'suspect', -10, '0')
suspect
(-10,)
-9
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'rarely', 2.0, 0)
rarely
(2.0,)
4.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'better', 4, '0')
better
(4,)
5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'twisted', -9, '0')
twisted
(-9,)
-8
2.0
1
1
1
1
2.0
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 23', 'good', 34, '0')
Good
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'totally', 2.0, 0)
totally
(2.0,)
4.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 58', 'enjoyable', 12, '0')
enjoyable
(12,)
13
1
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 07', 'dead', -1, '0')
dead
(-1,)
0
```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'scary', -7, '0')
scary
(-7,)
-6
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'independent', 10, '0')
independent
(10,)
11
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 08', 'poor', -12, '0')
poor
(-12,)
-11
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 03', 'inevitable', -10, '0')
inevitable
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'slightly', 1.0, 0)
slightly
(1.0,)
2.0
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'really', 8.0, 0)
really
(8.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'terrific', 10, '0')
terrific
(10,)
11
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 52', 'satirical', -10, '0')
satirical
(-10,)
-9

2.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 24', 'enjoyable', 13, '0')
 enjoyable
 (13,)
 14
 2.0
 2.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'very', 4096.0, 0)
 very
 (4096.0,)
 8192.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'outrageous', -9, '0')
 outrageous
 (-9,)
 -8
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 00', 'forced', -10, '0')
 forced
 (-10,)
 -9
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 51', 'ridiculous', -10, '0')
 ridiculous
 (-10,)
 -9
 2.0
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'happy', 1, '0')
 Happy
 -1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'worst', -10, '0')
 worst
 (-10,)
 -11
 ('2017-11-05 13: 53: 43', 'highly', 2.0, 0)
 highly
 (2.0,)
 1.0
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 41', 'irritating', -10, '0')
 irritating
 (-10,)
 -11
 0.5
 -1
 0.5
 -1
 0.5
 0.5
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 37', 'ignorant', -10, '0')
 ignorant
 (-10,)

```

-11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'rich', 10, '0')
rich
(10,)
9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 23', 'better', 5, '0')
better
(5,)
4
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 48', 'pathetic', -10, '0')
pathetic
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'so', 512.0, 0)
So
0.5
0.5
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 07', 'terrible', -11, '0')
terrible
(-11,)
-12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'highly', 1.0, 0)
highly
(1.0,)
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'not', 524288.0, 0)
not
(524288.0,)
262144.0
0.5
0.5
-1
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'right', 13, '0')
right
(13,)
12
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
0.5

```

```

0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 32', 'fake', -10, '0')
fake
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 26', 'fake', -11, '0')
fake
(-11,)
-12
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'strong', 11, '0')
strong
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'happy', -1, '0')
Happy
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'basic', 12, '0')
basic
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'classic', 14, '0')
classic
(14,)
15
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'whole', 10, '0')
whole
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'familiar', 11, '0')
familiar
(11,)
12
2.0
1
2.0
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'clear', 10, '0')
clear
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'safe', 10, '0')
safe

```

```

(10,)
11
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'never', -4.0, 0)
never
(-4.0,)
-8.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 46', 'obnoxious', -10, '0')
obnoxious
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'attractive', 11, '0')
attractive
(11,)
12
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 15', 'unexpected', -10, '0')
unexpected
(-10,)
-9
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'able', 12, '0')
able
(12,)
13
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'nice', 15, '0')
nice
(15,)
16
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'terrible', -12, '0')
terrible
(-12,)
-11
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 26', 'happy', 1, '0')
Happy
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'imaginative', 10, '0')
imaginative
(10,)

```

```

11
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'hugely', 4.0, 0)
hugely
(4.0,)
8.0
1
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 51', 'repetitive', -10, '0')
repetitive
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 43', 'mad', -10, '0')
mad
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 56', 'stereotypical', -10, '0')
stereotypical
(-10,)
-9
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 24', 'really', 16.0, 0)
really
(16.0,)
32.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'surprising', 10, '0')
surprising
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'really', 32.0, 0)
really
(32.0,)
64.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'happy', 1, '0')
Happy
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'better', 4, '0')
better
(4,)
5

```



```

1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'interesting', 9, '0')
interesting
(9,)
10
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'endless', 10, '0')
endless
(10,)
11
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'crazy', -9, '0')
crazy
(-9,)
-8
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'great', 20, '0')
great
(20,)
21
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'great', 21, '0')
great
(21,)
22
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'light', 11, '0')
light
(11,)
12
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'happy', 1, '0')
Happy
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 28', 'great', 22, '0')
great
(22,)
23
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'cheap', -8, '0')
cheap
(-8,)
-7
1
1
2.0

```

```

2.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 23', 'good', 1, '0')
good
(1,)
2
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'stereotypical', -9, '0')
stereotypical
(-9,)
-8
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 24', 'dead', 0, '0')
dead
(0,)
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'bad', -15, '0')
bad
(-15,)
-14
2.0
1
2.0
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'bold', 10, '0')
bold
(10,)
11
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'so', 0.5, 0)
so
(0.5,)
1.0

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'fun', 13, '0')
fun
(13,)
14
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 46', 'incredible', 11, '0')
incredible
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 13: 13: 00', 'unbearable', -10, '0')
unbearable
(-10,)
-9
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'very', 8192.0, 0)
very
(8192.0,)
16384.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 28', 'fun', 14, '0')
fun
(14,)
15
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'best', 3, '0')
best
(3,)
4
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'too', 512.0, 0)
too
(512.0,)
1024.0
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'repetitive', -9, '0')
repetitive
(-9,)
-8
2.0
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 29', 'too', 1024.0, 0)

```

```

too
(1024.0,)
2048.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 23', 'rarely', 4.0, 0)
rarely
(4.0,)
8.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 28', 'happy', 1, '0')
happy
(1,)
2
1
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'not', 262144.0, 0)
not
(262144.0,)
524288.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 29', 'very', 16384.0, 0)
very
(16384.0,)
32768.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'glad', 10, '0')
glad
(10,)
11
2.0
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'nice', 16, '0')
nice
(16,)
17
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'favorite', 12, '0')

```

```

favorite
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 28', 'so', 1.0, 0)
so
(1.0,)
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'really', 64.0, 0)
really
(64.0,)
128.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 28', 'great', 23, '0')
great
(23,)
24
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 24', 'scary', -6, '0')
scary
(-6,)
-5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'great', 24, '0')
great
(24,)
25
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 29', 'not', 524288.0, 0)
not
(524288.0,)
1048576.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 29', 'best', 4, '0')
best
(4,)
5
2.0
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'not', 1048576.0, 0)
not
(1048576.0,)
2097152.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'funny', 14, '0')
funny
(14,)
15
1

```

```

1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 29', 'very', 32768.0, 0)
very
(32768.0,)
65536.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 26', 'whole', 11, '0')
whole
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'really', 128.0, 0)
really
(128.0,)
256.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 28', 'good', 2, '0')
good
(2,)
3
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'good', 3, '0')
good
(3,)
4
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'great', 25, '0')
great
(25,)
26
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 29', 'happy', 2, '0')
Happy
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 53', 'simple', 13, '0')
Simple
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'popular', 11, '0')
popular
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'good', 4, '0')
good
(4,)
5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'curious', 11, '0')
curious
(11,)

```

```

12
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'really', 256.0, 0)
really
(256.0,)
512.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'great', 26, '0')
great
(26,)
27
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'not', 2097152.0, 0)
not
(2097152.0,)
4194304.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 46', 'mysterious', -10, '0')
mysterious
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'mysterious', -9, '0')
mysterious
(-9,)
-8
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 52', 'brilliant', 14, '0')
brilliant
(14,)
15
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'better', 5, '0')
better
(5,)
6
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 26', 'classic', 15, '0')
classic
(15,)
16
2.0
2.0

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'novel', 10, '0')
novel
(10,)
11
2.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 38', 'greatest', 10, '0')
greatest
(10,)
11
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'amazing', 11, '0')
amazing
(11,)
12
1
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'greatest', 11, '0')
greatest
(11,)
12
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'brilliant', 15, '0')
brilliant
(15,)
16
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 00', 'especially', 8.0, 0)
especially
(8.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'fantastic', 14, '0')
fantastic
(14,)
15
2.0

```



```

2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'best', 5, '0')
best
(5,)
6
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'not', 4194304.0, 0)
not
(4194304.0,)
8388608.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 23', 'fully', 16.0, 0)
fully
(16.0,)
32.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'so', 2.0, 0)
so
(2.0,)
4.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 06', 'almost', 0.125, 0)
almost
(0.125,)
0.25
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'certain', 12, '0')
certain
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 52', 'proud', 9, '0')
proud
(9,)
10
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'very', 65536.0, 0)
very
(65536.0,)
131072.0
1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'great', 27, '0')
great
(27,)
26
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'great', 26, '0')
great

```

```

(26,)
25
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'not', 8388608.0, 0)
not
(8388608.0,)
4194304.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'not', 4194304.0, 0)
Not
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'sure', 15, '0')
sure
(15,)
14
0.5
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 39', 'positive', 10, '0')
positive
(10,)
9
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 52', 'sad', -10, '0')
sad
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'good', 5, '0')
good
(5,)
4
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'so', 4.0, 0)
so
(4.0,)
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 13', 'special', 12, '0')
special
(12,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 07', 'weak', -9, '0')
weak
(-9,)
-10
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 13: 03', 'weird', -10, '0')
weird
(-10,)
-11
0.5
0.5

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 04', 'lack', -10, '0')
lack
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'not', 0.5, 0)
not
(0.5,)
0.25
-1
-1
0.5
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'so', 2.0, 0)
so
(2.0,)
1.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'really', 512.0, 0)
really
(512.0,)
256.0
0.5
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 45', 'monotonous', -10, '0')
monotonous
(-10,)
-11
-1
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
-1
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'so', 1.0, 0)
so
(1.0,)
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'fully', 32.0, 0)
fully
(32.0,)

```

16.0
 -1
 -1
 -1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'so', 0.5, 0)
 so
 (0.5,)

0.25
 ('2017-11-05 13: 12: 27', 'desperate', -10, '0')
 desperate
 (-10,)

-11
 -1
 -1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'capable', 11, '0')
 capable
 (11,)

10
 -1
 -1
 0.5
 -1
 -1
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'not', 0.25, 0)
 not
 (0.25,)

0.125
 -1
 -1
 -1
 -1
 0.5
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'great', 25, '0')
 great
 (25,)

24
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'not', 0.125, 0)
 not
 (0.125,)

0.0625
 0.5
 0.5
 0.5
 ('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'loud', -11, '0')
 loud
 (-11,)

-12
 -1

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'classic', 16, '0')
classic
(16,)
15
0.5
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'good', 4, '0')
Good
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 28', 'bad', -14, '0')
bad
(-14,)
-15
0.5
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'not', 0.0625, 0)
not
(0.0625,)
0.03125
-1
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'really', 256.0, 0)
really
(256.0,)
128.0
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 24', 'poor', -11, '0')
poor
(-11,)
-12
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'stupid', 1, '0')
stupid
(1,)
0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'really', 128.0, 0)
really
(128.0,)
64.0
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'really', 64.0, 0)

```

```

really
(64.0,)
32.0
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 28', 'dead', 1, '0')
dead
(1,)
0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 26', 'never', -8.0, 0)
never
(-8.0,)
-4.0
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'not', 0.03125, 0)
not
(0.03125,)
0.015625
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'stupid', 0, '0')
stupid
(0,)
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'dead', 0, '0')
dead
(0,)
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'really', 32.0, 0)
really
(32.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'stupid', -1, '0')
stupid
(-1,)
-2
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 21', 'blah', -10, '0')
blah
(-10,)
-11
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 52', 'boring', -8, '0')
boring
(-8,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'not', 0.015625, 0)
Not
0.5

```

```

-1
0.5
-1
0.5
0.5
0.5
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'not', 0.5, 0)
not
(0.5,)
0.25
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 36', 'not', 0.25, 0)
not
(0.25,)
0.125
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'good', -1, '0')
good
(-1,)
-2
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 36', 'not', 0.125, 0)
not
(0.125,)
0.0625
0.5
0.5
-1
0.5
0.5
0.5
0.5
0.5
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'very', 131072.0, 0)
very
(131072.0,)
65536.0
-1
-1
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 36', 'very', 65536.0, 0)
very
(65536.0,)
32768.0

```

```

-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'so', 0.25, 0)
so
(0.25,)
0.125
0.5
0.5
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 36', 'not', 0.0625, 0)
not
(0.0625,)
0.03125
-1
-1
0.5
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 47', 'overpriced', -10, '0')
overpriced
(-10,)
-11
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 36', 'so', 0.125, 0)
so
(0.125,)
0.0625
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'right', 12, '0')
right
(12,)
11
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'almost', 0.25, 0)
almost
(0.25,)
0.125
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'excited', 11, '0')
excited
(11,)
10

```



```

-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 36', 'very', 32768.0, 0)
very
(32768.0,)
16384.0
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'beautiful', 12, '0')
beautiful
(12,)
11
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 36', 'not', 0.03125, 0)
not
(0.03125,)
0.015625
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'not', 0.015625, 0)
not
(0.015625,)
0.0078125
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 36', 'so', 0.0625, 0)
so
(0.0625,)
0.03125
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'so', 0.03125, 0)
so
(0.03125,)
0.015625
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 36', 'good', -2, '0')
good
(-2,)
-3
-1
0.5
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'bad', -15, '0')
bad
(-15,)
-16
0.5
0.5

```

```

0.5
-1
-1
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'really', 16.0, 0)
really
(16.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'terrible', -11, '0')
terrible
(-11,)
-12
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'bad', -16, '0')
bad
(-16,)
-17
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
-1
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'so', 0.015625, 0)
so
(0.015625,)
0.0078125
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'sad', -11, '0')
sad
(-11,)
-12
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 38', 'bad', -17, '0')
bad
(-17,)
-18
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 37', 'efficient', 10, '0')
efficient
(10,)

```

```

9
0.5
-1
-1
-1
0.5
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'good', -3, '0')
good
(-3,)
-4
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'sure', 14, '0')
sure
(14,)
13
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 37', 'hollow', -10, '0')
hollow
(-10,)
-11
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'weak', -10, '0')
weak
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'really', 8.0, 0)
really
(8.0,)
4.0
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'powerful', 10, '0')
powerful
(10,)
9
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'simple', 1, '0')
simple
(1,)
0
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 38', 'simple', 0, '0')
simple
(0,)
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'great', 24, '0')
great
(24,)
23
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'spiritual', 10, '0')
spiritual
(10,)
9
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 38', 'so', 0.0078125, 0)
so
(0.0078125,)
0.00390625
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 39', 'great', 23, '0')
great
(23,)
22
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'not', 0.0078125, 0)
not
(0.0078125,)
0.00390625
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'completely', 8.0, 0)
completely
(8.0,)
4.0
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'best', 6, '0')
best
(6,)
5
-1
0.5
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
-1

```

```

-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'never', -4.0, 0)
never
(-4.0,)
-2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 39', 'not', 0.00390625, 0)
not
(0.00390625,)
0.001953125
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 38', 'really', 4.0, 0)
really
(4.0,)
2.0
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 38', 'good', -4, '0')
good
(-4,)
-5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'good', -5, '0')
good
(-5,)
-6
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'pathetic', -11, '0')
pathetic
(-11,)
-12
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 39', 'not', 0.001953125, 0)
not
(0.001953125,)
0.0009765625
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 38', 'sure', 13, '0')
sure
(13,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 39', 'so', 0.00390625, 0)
so
(0.00390625,)
0.001953125
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'not', 0.0009765625, 0)
not

```

```

(0.0009765625,)
0.00048828125
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'so', 0.001953125, 0)
so
(0.001953125,)
0.0009765625
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 15', 'unnecessary', -10, '0')
unnecessary
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'not', 0.00048828125, 0)
not
(0.00048828125,)
0.000244140625
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'poor', -12, '0')
poor
(-12,)
-13
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 53', 'senseless', -10, '0')
senseless
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 07', 'sorry', -11, '0')
sorry
(-11,)
-12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'so', 0.0009765625, 0)
so
(0.0009765625,)
0.00048828125
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 38', 'bad', -18, '0')
bad
(-18,)
-19
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'so', 0.00048828125, 0)
so
(0.00048828125,)
0.000244140625
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'bad', -19, '0')
bad
(-19,)
-20

```

```

0.5
0.5
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'not', 0.000244140625, 0)
not
(0.000244140625,)
0.0001220703125
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'good', -6, '0')
good
(-6,)
-7
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 37', 'desired', 10, '0')
desired
(10,)
9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'almost', 0.125, 0)
almost
(0.125,)
0.0625
-1
-1
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 23', 'fine', 12, '0')
fine
(12,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'beautiful', 11, '0')
beautiful
(11,)
10
-1
-1
-1
-1
0.5
-1
-1

```

```

                                IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'gorgeous', 11, '0')
gorgeous
(11,)
10
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'not', 0.0001220703125, 0)
not
(0.0001220703125,)
6.103515625e-05
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'so', 0.000244140625, 0)
so
(0.000244140625,)
0.00048828125
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 39', 'really', 2.0, 0)
really
(2.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'excited', 10, '0')
excited
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 41', 'not', 6.103515625e-05, 0)
not
(6.103515625e-05,)
0.0001220703125
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 15', 'disappointed', -9, '0')
disappointed
(-9,)
-8
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'brilliant', 16, '0')
brilliant
(16,)
17
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'very', 16384.0, 0)
very
(16384.0,)
32768.0
2.0
2.0
1
2.0

```


IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 50', 'quite', 8.0, 0)
quite
(8.0,)
16.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 39', 'pleased', 10, '0')
pleased
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'especially', 16.0, 0)
especially
(16.0,)
32.0
2.0
2.0
1
1
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'entirely', 4.0, 0)
entirely
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 43', 'limited', -10, '0')
limited
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'amazing', 12, '0')
amazing
(12,)
13
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'entirely', 8.0, 0)
entirely
(8.0,)
16.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 41', 'not', 0.0001220703125, 0)
Not
2.0
2.0
1
1
2.0

```

2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'amazing', 13, '0')
amazing
(13,)
14
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 54', 'skeptical', -10, '0')
skeptical
(-10,)
-9
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'not', 2.0, 0)
not
(2.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 22', 'perfect', 10, '0')
perfect
(10,)
11
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'fantastic', 15, '0')
fantastic
(15,)
16
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'not', 4.0, 0)
not
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 26', 'able', 13, '0')
able
(13,)
14
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 27', 'interesting', 10, '0')
interesting
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'young', 11, '0')
young
(11,)
12
2.0
1

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 43', 'not', 8.0, 0)
not
(8.0,)
16.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 41', 'really', 4.0, 0)
really
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 09', 'hard', -13, '0')
hard
(-13,)
-12
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 43', 'not', 16.0, 0)
not
(16.0,)
32.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 43', 'quick', 10, '0')
quick
(10,)
11
2.0
1
2.0
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 43', 'really', 8.0, 0)
really
(8.0,)
16.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 26', 'unexpected', -9, '0')
unexpected
(-9,)
-8
2.0
1

```

```

1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 43', 'fantastic', 16, '0')
fantastic
(16,)
17
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 05', 'lovely', 9, '0')
Lovely
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 12', 'intense', -11, '0')
intense
(-11,)
-10
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'honest', 10, '0')
honest
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'bad', -20, '0')
bad
(-20,)
-19
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'very', 32768.0, 0)
very
(32768.0,)
65536.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 26', 'strong', 12, '0')
strong
(12,)
13
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 03', 'wrong', -11, '0')
wrong
(-11,)
-10
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 39', 'best', 5, '0')
best
(5,)
6
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 40', 'superior', 10, '0')
superior

```

```

(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 41', 'earnest', 10, '0')
earnest
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 16', 'excellent', 12, '0')
excellent
(12,)
13
1
1
1
2.0
2.0
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'good', -7, '0')
good
(-7,)
-6
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'fully', 16.0, 0)
fully
(16.0,)
32.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 11', 'difficult', -9, '0')
difficult
(-9,)
-8
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 44', 'excellent', 13, '0')
excellent
(13,)
14
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 44', 'very', 65536.0, 0)
very
(65536.0,)
131072.0
1
2.0
1
1

```

```

2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 29', 'too', 2048.0, 0)
too
(2048.0,)
4096.0
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 44', 'good', -6, '0')
good
(-6,)
-5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'excellent', 14, '0')
excellent
(14,)
15
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 41', 'fine', 11, '0')
fine
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'good', -5, '0')
good
(-5,)
-4
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'enjoyable', 14, '0')
enjoyable
(14,)
15
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 12', 'slow', -10, '0')
slow
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'boring', -9, '0')
boring
(-9,)
-8
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'better', 6, '0')
better
(6,)
7
2.0
1
1
2.0
1

```

```

1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 43', 'not', 32.0, 0)
not
(32.0,)
64.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'too', 4096.0, 0)
too
(4096.0,)
8192.0
1
1
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 41', 'so', 0.00048828125, 0)
so
(0.00048828125,)
0.0009765625
('2017-11-05 13: 53: 42', 'fabulously', 2.0, 0)
fabulously
(2.0,)
4.0
1
1
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 38', 'powerful', 9, '0')
powerful
(9,)
10
1
2.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 43', 'fantastic', 17, '0')
fantastic
(17,)
18
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 44', 'wonderful', 10, '0')
wonderful
(10,)
11
2.0
1
2.0

```

```

1
2.0
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 46', 'so', 0.0009765625, 0)
so
(0.0009765625,)
0.00048828125
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'excellent', 15, '0')
excellent
(15,)
14
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 43', 'really', 16.0, 0)
really
(16.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'very', 131072.0, 0)
Very
0.5
0.5
0.5
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 02', 'rubbish', -9, '0')
rubbish
(-9,)
-10
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'not', 64.0, 0)
not
(64.0,)
32.0
0.5
0.5
0.5
-1
-1
0.5
0.5
-1
0.5
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'better', 7, '0')
better
(7,)

```



```

6
-1
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'boring', -8, '0')
boring
(-8,)
-9
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 46', 'not', 32.0, 0)
not
(32.0,)
16.0
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'not', 16.0, 0)
not
(16.0,)
8.0
0.5
0.5
0.5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'not', 8.0, 0)
not
(8.0,)
4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'good', -4, '0')
good
(-4,)
-5
0.5
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 17', 'worse', -10, '0')
worse
(-10,)
-11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'terrible', -12, '0')
Terrible
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 39', 'great', 22, '0')
great
(22,)
23
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'amazing', 14, '0')
amazing
(14,)
15
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 46', 'very', 0.5, 0)
very
(0.5,)

```

```

1.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 12', 'serious', -10, '0')
serious
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 51', 'absolutely', 4.0, 0)
absolutely
(4.0,)
8.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 49', 'lucky', 12, '0')
lucky
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 19', 'fresh', 11, '0')
fresh
(11,)
12
1
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'not', 4.0, 0)
not
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 48', 'pretty', 11, '0')
pretty
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 54', 'easy', 8, '0')
easy
(8,)
9
2.0
1
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 17', 'dark', -9, '0')
dark
(-9,)
-8
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 46', 'really', 8.0, 0)
really

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

```
(8.0,)  
16.0  
( '2017-11-05 17: 18: 20', 'interested', 12, '0')  
interested  
(12,)  
13  
1  
( '2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'not', 8.0, 0)  
Not  
2.0  
2.0  
2.0  
2.0  
1  
( '2017-11-05 17: 18: 46', 'so', 0.00048828125, 0)  
so  
(0.00048828125,)  
0.0009765625  
( '2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'easy', 9, '0')  
easy  
(9,)  
10  
1  
1  
1  
1  
1  
1  
2.0  
( '2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'very', 1.0, 0)  
very  
(1.0,)  
2.0  
1  
1  
1  
1  
1  
1  
( '2017-11-05 17: 18: 48', 'very', 2.0, 0)  
very  
(2.0,)  
4.0  
( '2017-11-05 17: 18: 44', 'best', 6, '0')  
best  
(6,)  
7  
1  
1  
2.0
```

```

2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'great', 23, '0')
great
(23,)
24
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 38', 'weak', -11, '0')
weak
(-11,)
-10
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'warm', 10, '0')
warm
(10,)
11
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 48', 'very', 4.0, 0)
very
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 47', 'odd', -10, '0')
odd
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'brilliant', 17, '0')
brilliant
(17,)
18
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 41', 'almost', 0.0625, 0)
almost
(0.0625,)
0.125
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 18', 'afraid', -10, '0')
afraid
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 48', 'overwhelming', -10, '0')
overwhelming
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 48', 'dark', -8, '0')
dark
(-8,)
-7
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'serious', -9, '0')
serious
(-9,)

```

```

-8
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'enjoyable', 15, '0')
enjoyable
(15,)
16
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 49', 'serious', -8, '0')
serious
(-8,)
-7
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 37', 'right', 11, '0')
right
(11,)
12
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'loud', -12, '0')
loud
(-12,)
-11
1
1
2.0
1
1
1
1
2.0
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 43', 'impossible', -9, '0')
impossible
(-9,)
-8
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'highly', 0.5, 0)
highly
(0.5,)
1.0
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 48', 'not', 2.0, 0)
not
(2.0,)

```

```

4.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'classic', 15, '0')
classic
(15,)
16
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 40', 'sure', 12, '0')
sure
(12,)
13
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'greatest', 12, '0')
greatest
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'worse', -11, '0')
worse
(-11,)
-10
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 46', 'better', 6, '0')
better
(6,)
7
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'sure', 13, '0')
sure
(13,)
14
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 39', 'never', -2.0, 0)
never
(-2.0,)
-4.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'highly', 1.0, 0)
highly
(1.0,)
2.0
1
1
2.0
2.0
1

```

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'not', 4.0, 0)
not
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 41', 'authentic', 10, '0')
authentic
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'funny', 15, '0')
funny
(15,)
16
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 48', 'so', 0.0009765625, 0)
so
(0.0009765625,)
0.001953125
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 48', 'best', 7, '0')
best
(7,)
8
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'best', 8, '0')
best
(8,)
9
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 39', 'leading', 10, '0')
leading
(10,)
11
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'best', 9, '0')
best
(9,)
10
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'absolutely', 8.0, 0)
absolutely
(8.0,)
16.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'good', -5, '0')

```

```

good
(-5,)
-4
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'best', 10, '0')
best
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'not', 8.0, 0)
not
(8.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'funny', 16, '0')
funny
(16,)
17
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 49', 'dark', -7, '0')
dark
(-7,)
-6
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 44', 'honest', 11, '0')
honest
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'never', -4.0, 0)
never
(-4.0,)
-8.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'amazing', 15, '0')
amazing
(15,)
16
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 35', 'dead', -1, '0')
dead
(-1,)
0
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 57', 'stubborn', -10, '0')
stubborn
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 48', 'great', 24, '0')
great
(24,)
25
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'great', 25, '0')
great

```



```

(25,)
26
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 44', 'dangerous', -9, '0')
Dangerous
1
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 48', 'really', 16.0, 0)
really
(16.0,)
32.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'not', 16.0, 0)
not
(16.0,)
32.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'best', 11, '0')
best
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'dark', -6, '0')
dark
(-6,)
-5
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'not', 32.0, 0)
not
(32.0,)
64.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'not', 64.0, 0)
not
(64.0,)
128.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'mysterious', -8, '0')
mysterious
(-8,)
-7
1
2.0
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'aware', 11, '0')
aware

```

```

(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 25', 'worst', -11, '0')
worst
(-11,)
-10
1
2.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 49', 'very', 8.0, 0)
very
(8.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'calm', 11, '0')
calm
(11,)
12
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 18', 'quiet', 11, '0')
quiet
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 46', 'excellent', 14, '0')
excellent
(14,)
15
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'good', -4, '0')
good
(-4,)
-3
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 45', 'too', 8192.0, 0)
too
(8192.0,)
16384.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'very', 16.0, 0)
very
(16.0,)
32.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 14', 'natural', 11, '0')
natural
(11,)
12
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 41', 'beautiful', 10, '0')
beautiful

```

```

(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'so', 0.001953125, 0)
so
(0.001953125,)
0.00390625
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 41', 'gorgeous', 10, '0')
Gorgeous
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'key', 10, '0')
key
(10,)
11
1
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'good', -3, '0')
good
(-3,)
-2
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 32', 'certain', 13, '0')
certain
(13,)
14
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'not', 128.0, 0)
not
(128.0,)
256.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 48', 'annoying', -10, '0')
annoying
(-10,)
-9
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'very', 32.0, 0)
very
(32.0,)
64.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 49', 'almost', 0.125, 0)
almost
(0.125,)
0.25
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 50', 'impossible', -8, '0')

```

```

impossible
(-8,)
-7
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 53', 'good', -2, '0')
good
(-2,)
-1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 53', 'not', 256.0, 0)
not
(256.0,)
512.0
1
1
1
1
1
1
2.0
1
2.0
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'really', 32.0, 0)
really
(32.0,)
64.0
1
2.0
2.0
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'too', 16384.0, 0)
too
(16384.0,)
32768.0
1
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 51', 'confusing', -10, '0')
confusing
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 47', 'pretty', 12, '0')
pretty
(12,)
13
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 43', 'young', 12, '0')
young
(12,)
13

```

```

2.0
2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'grand', 10, '0')
grand
(10,)
11
1
2.0
1
1
1
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 44', 'strong', 13, '0')
strong
(13,)
14
1
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 53', 'not', 512.0, 0)
not
(512.0,)
1024.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 44', 'intense', -10, '0')
intense
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 13: 13: 03', 'wild', -10, '0')
wild
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 54', 'wild', -9, '0')
wild
(-9,)
-8
1
1
2.0
2.0
1
1
2.0
1
1

```

```

2.0
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 53', 'very', 64.0, 0)
very
(64.0,)
128.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 33', 'special', 11, '0')
special
(11,)
12
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 54', 'strong', 14, '0')
strong
(14,)
15
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 54', 'not', 1024.0, 0)
not
(1024.0,)
2048.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 21', 'incredibly', 8.0, 0)
incredibly
(8.0,)
16.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 46', 'vivid', 10, '0')
vivid
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 46', 'nightmare', -10, '0')
nightmare
(-10,)
-9
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'excellent', 15, '0')
excellent
(15,)
16
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 45', 'wow', 10, '0')
wow
(10,)
11
2.0
1
1
1

```

```

1
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'quiet', 12, '0')
quiet
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 54', 'not', 2048.0, 0)
not
(2048.0,)
4096.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 31', 'curious', 12, '0')
curious
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 43', 'interesting', 11, '0')
interesting
(11,)
12
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 12', 'stunning', 9, '0')
stunning
(9,)
10
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 55', 'stunning', 10, '0')
stunning
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 55', 'stunning', 11, '0')
stunning
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'best', 12, '0')
best
(12,)
13
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'so', 0.00390625, 0)
so
(0.00390625,)
0.0078125
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 46', 'fantastic', 18, '0')
fantastic
(18,)
19
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'great', 26, '0')

```

```

great
(26,)
27
1
1
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 55', 'not', 4096.0, 0)
not
(4096.0,)
8192.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 42', 'let', 10, '0')
let
(10,)
11
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 53', 'too', 32768.0, 0)
too
(32768.0,)
65536.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'perfect', 11, '0')
perfect
(11,)
12
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'natural', 12, '0')
natural
(12,)
13
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'beautiful', 11, '0')
beautiful
(11,)
12
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 56', 'too', 65536.0, 0)
too
(65536.0,)
131072.0
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 56', 'perfect', 12, '0')
perfect
(12,)
13
1
2.0
2.0

```



```

1
2.0
('2017-11-05 13: 11: 37', 'easier', 10, '0')
easier
(10,)
11
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'quite', 16.0, 0)
quite
(16.0,)
32.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 53', 'really', 64.0, 0)
really
(64.0,)
128.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 55', 'not', 8192.0, 0)
not
(8192.0,)
16384.0
1
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 56', 'not', 16384.0, 0)
not
(16384.0,)
32768.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 55', 'best', 13, '0')
best
(13,)
14
2.0
2.0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 34', 'capable', 10, '0')
capable
(10,)
11
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 52', 'mysterious', -7, '0')
mysterious
(-7,)
-6
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 05', 'manipulative', -10, '0')
manipulative
(-10,)

```

```

-9
1
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 56', 'not', 32768.0, 0)
not
(32768.0,)
65536.0
2.0
1
2.0
1
('2017-11-05 17: 17: 45', 'extremely', 4.0, 0)
extremely
(4.0,)
8.0
('2017-11-05 13: 13: 02', 'upsetting', -10, '0')
upsetting
(-10,)
-9
1
1
1
('2017-11-05 13: 12: 24', 'complex', -10, '0')
complex
(-10,)
-9
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 30', 'whole', 12, '0')
whole
(12,)
13
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 53', 'good', -1, '0')
good
(-1,)
0
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 44', 'bad', -19, '0')
bad
(-19,)
-18
1
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 51', 'amazing', 16, '0')
amazing
(16,)
17
('2017-11-05 17: 18: 42', 'especially', 32.0, 0)
especially
(32.0,)

```

IDLE_tmp_61q9tr_h

64.0

('2017-11-05 17: 18: 55', 'fantastic', 19, '0')

fantastic

(19,)

20

1

2.0

2.0

2.0

>>>