

## The reviews as sourced from IMDb

Best war:

- Schindler's list
- The pianist
- Come and see
- Apocalypse now
- Paths of glory

Worst horror:

- Chinese erotic ghost stories
- I spit on your grave: Déjà vu
- Alone in the dark
- Dracula 3d
- Children of the living dead

**Schindler's list:**

**Amazing!**

This Movie was sensational. It was a piece of art along with being informational. It told people about the holocaust, and it also told people about the human spirit. It shows how people can just triumph over anything with just some help from one person The things that Spielberg did with the movie was incredible too. The black and white was genius, and how he had the little girl in red and the fire was phenuminal. I have never seen anything like it, Schindler's List is beyond all words.

**The pianist**

**Brilliantly Narrated, Visually Stunning!**

Polanski has depicted the gory details of the holocaust without much restraint. But, the most wonderful aspect of the film is that the director has not lost focus of his story and instead of focusing too much on the holocaust horror he has weaved the true-life narrative of survival around devillish happenings. Every single act of escapade Szpilman goes through is depicted like a drop of

water on a barren desert. However, the Oasis in the driest desert comes in the end and it is here that Polanski captures the essence of human emotion. I had this very strong urge of jumping into the theater screen and magically adopting a character in the movie and doing something about the helplessness portrayed so convincingly. Overall, Polanski has given a stunning visual narrative of the cold war. Survival indeed is a privilege though it is taken for granted today. Performances by Brody, Kretschmann deserve applause. Pawel Edelman's camera work is moving and he has brilliantly captured the dark sadness in the visual canvas in an effective way. The lighting is amazing. Pre-dawn shooting schedule could have helped a great deal. Hervé de Luze's editing work has ensured that the narrative does not slip away from focus. Most notable is the scene where the human bodies are lit on fire and the camera raises to show the smoke. The darkness of the smoke is enhanced and is used effectively to fade the scene out. The scene where Brody's fingers move as he rests his hands on the bars of the tram handle only goes to show the brilliance of Polanski as a film-maker. Great film that will be in the running for this year's Oscars. I will give it a 9 Out of 10.

### **Come and see**

#### **Jaw-droppingly powerful and truly disturbing Russian war drama.**

"Come and See" has to be one of the most powerful war movies ever made. It left me emotionally drained. The film tells the story of 12-year-old Florya (Alexi Kravchenko), whose desire is to join his countrymen in the battle against the fascists. His enthusiasm is written all over his face: in the opening scenes, which show Florya's recruitment by partisan soldiers, he wears the blissed-out smile of a hopeful child. After a bombardment, which leaves him temporarily deaf, he is left behind and stumbles across Glasha (Olga Mironova), who has also been abandoned. Together they return to his village, the atrocities witnessed there anticipating horrors to come. "Come and See" is a deeply unsettling film. It's hallucinatory, hellish, traumatizing and uncompromising. There's an aura of profound sadness here, as Florya ages dramatically over the course of the story's events. The film's most disturbing sequence revolves around the raising of one village and the slaughter of most of its inhabitants. The acting is excellent, the cinematography is stunning and the use of Mozart on the soundtrack is particularly effective. 10 out of 10. A must-see!

### **Apocalypse now**

#### **One of the best and most important movies ever**

This movie changed the art of film making, telling a complex story in a powerful new way. It's a damn beautiful film. The mood, as they slowly drift up the Vietnamese river, keeps building and building and you can smell the heat and wetness in the air, feel the sweat dripping down your back, hear the hollow echoing screaming around you. The film mixes brutal realism with fantasy,

intercutting a modern war with strange scenes full of technicolour smoke. The film uses music not as a score laid in later, but as a practical part of the scene playing from speakers, radios etc. Coppola uses a classic piece of literature as inspiration, taking scenes and characters, and putting them into entirely different surroundings. That is a tricky and brave thing to do. Then he takes a superstar, Brando, pays him a fortune, and films him so that you can barely see his face. The pure guts that such a move requires is astounding, and it works beautifully. This movie belongs in the top ten.

## **Paths of glory**

### **Hard-hitting anti-war movie**

PATHS OF GLORY is a typically powerful anti-war movie from director Stanley Kubrick, starring Kirk Douglas in one of his most mature roles. The setting is WW1 and the film follows the French army as they attempt to defend and retaliate against a massive German bombardment. Conflict comes from the machinations of an over-zealous officer who is determined to see success achieved at all costs, no matter the casualties taken along the way. An ensemble of fine performances, taut direction and an intelligent script all combine to make one of the hardest-hitting war movies out there.

## **Chinese erotic ghost stories**

### **Unfunny**

This is essentially the joke of the farmers daughter stretched to 90 minutes. For my taste thats 89 minutes too long. Think of it as a good looking sex comedy that isn't really funny or sexy. Clearly its suppose to be and many of the cast mug shamelessly, in the hopes of getting a laugh or disrobe in the hopes of getting a rise out of the audience unfortunately its all for naught, little of this film actually works, or works in such away that is interesting to watch. Honestly I picked this up thinking this was "An Erotic Ghost Story" which I had heard is pretty good. Clearly I'll have to make sure I get the right name next time. Pass this one up, its just a waste of time.

## **I spit on your grave: Déjà vu**

## I spit on this film

This has got to be a contender for the worst sequel of all time title. I was so looking forward to this as I really enjoyed the first one all those years ago and was interested in seeing where Jennifer Hills character ended up after the first movie. But whoah! I didn't expect this dross.

I've no idea who this is even aimed at, it's not shocking or graphic, it's so badly written and poorly acted and is full of some of the most awful characters ever put onto film. Maria Olsen's character is so weird and over the top that she ruins every scene she's in. There's countless scenes where people just turn up at the right place and time to push the film onto the next scene, almost as if they have psychic powers and teleportation devices. (Oh look, our main protagonist just ran off into a massive forest and within seconds runs straight into the bad guys who are standing around at the exact spot for her to run into, what a coincidence)

The film rolls in at nearly TWO AND A HALF HOURS and there's a reason for this. Countless scenes of things that should last a few seconds like a character raking up leaves that go on for minutes at a time. Scenes of dialogue that just go on and on without ever adding to the story etc etc

## **Alone in the dark**

### shockingly bad

I was honestly surprised by Alone in the Dark. It was so bad, I could hardly believe what I was seeing. There are no characters, just a few stereotypes wandering around and getting killed. The extent of the character development was giving each character a name and an occupation, and that's about it. There was no real plot, and none of the characters seemed to have any motivation. In fact, many action scenes just began on their own, coming from nowhere with a pounding techno track. While I was watching this movie I kept asking "Where is this happening? What's going on?" The acting was high school drama quality, with stiff wooden delivery, as though the actors were reading from cue cards without comprehending their lines. Their trouble delivering lines was made even more obvious by horrible sound design. ADR sounded like it was recorded in an open room. The actors were constantly taking obvious care to hit their marks, looking almost robotic in their movements. So, these listless automatons are whisked through a series of implausible and confusing scenarios, often without even the benefit of transition scenes. They were here, now they're there. This was happening, now that's happening. Random scenes with little rhyme or reason.

## **Dracula 3d**

## **If this is Dario Argento's vision of Dracula, it would have been better if he kept it to himself**

I am a huge fan of Gothic horror and Dracula films in particular. I am especially fond of the Hammer films with Christopher Lee and Peter Cushing. I also like the Bela Legosi ones, as well as big budget Hollywood epics by directors Francis Ford Coppla and John Badam. Hell, I even found Dracula 2000 to be somewhat enjoyable. So it is a huge disappointment to me that the legendary Dario Argento dropped the ball on this production. It seems Mr. Argento, who should know better forgot how to make a film. This flick is poorly edited, looks like crap and is put together haphazardly. Words truly cannot express how bad and fake the digital f/x look in this film. By far THE WORST CGI I have ever seen! The storytelling is inept, made worst with terrible editing. The cast lacks direction and chemistry, which makes it harder not only to view a cohesive film, but care about the characters outcome. Thomas Kretschman lacked intensity and screen presence to make a good Dracula. Casting Rutger Hauer as Van Helsing was one of the things Argento did do right. However, his screen time is limited and was'nt given enough time to develop his character. There is blood (mostly CG) and the lovely ladies of Dracula 3D show us their breasts and backsides. (including Dario's own daughter, the ever so attractive Asia Argento) The erotic elements will receive no complaint from me, but do not make up for such a bad film. Argento's Dracula is 110 minutes long and I would have found that time better spent rearranging my sock drawer.

## **Children of the living dead**

## **Redefining the word 'Bad'**

I wrote a very long review before but for some reason only my summary was up, so here goes at a second attempt. Being the dead fan I am (I have a dead trilogy website) I couldn't resist seeing this movie, even knowing that it would be pretty bad in comparison to Romero's movies. Quite simply, I was blown away. Never before (and I mean this) have I seen such a dire plot, such awful acting and such diabolical camera work. This film isn't even one of those 'So bad it's good' events, failing on every possible level. Cue 90 minutes of unbelievably bad dubbing, atrocious story lines and god-awful filming techniques. It is so hard to express how bad this film is. The film jumps forward 14 years, then 1 year and so on yet has no continuity. We do not know what is going on as each time segment has no relation to the previous one. It is criminal that this film was ever made, and the cheek of John Russo (who I would take great pleasure in torturing) to call this the 'long awaited sequel'. How can people possibly believe that this is good? Surely someone on set would have realised that they were making one of the worst films in history (and that's no lie either). To be honest, I would go so far as to pay people not to watch this, in the vain hope that all copies would be pulled from shelves and the negatives be burnt. I can't even give this an IMDB rating of one as it simply does not deserve that kind of credibility. Atrocious.